

By Mr. ROSECRANS: The resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, California, protesting against the transfer of the revenue-marine service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: The petition of Rev. J. A. Edie and others, of the United Presbyterian Congregation, of New Brighton; of the Mount Pleasant Presbyterian church, of Darlington; of the United Presbyterian church, First Methodist Episcopal Protestant church, German Evangelical church, Immanuel's Church of the Evangelical Association, Methodist Episcopal church, Reformed Presbyterian church, the Presbyterian church, and the faculty of Geneva College, of Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, on behalf of lands in severalty, citizenship, education, and religious liberty for the Indians—severally to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: The petition of H. Robinson and 24 others, ex-soldiers of the third Congressional district of Iowa, protesting against the repeal of the tax on whisky and tobacco, and in favor of such import duties as will protect the prices of labor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following petitions relating to tariff legislation were presented and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. ATHERTON: Of M. F. Abell & Co. and others, workingmen in glass, of Zanesville, Ohio.

By Mr. BELMONT: Of Ira R. Bamber and others, employes of John Gibson, of New York city.

By Mr. S. S. COX: Of D. Appleton & Co. and others, publishers, of New York city.

By Mr. ERRETT: Of the resolution adopted by a meeting of citizens of Homestead, Allegheny County, and of resolutions of Sheffield, Unity, and Keystone Association, of Knights of Labor of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. HILL: Of employes of Joseph Wharton, at Hackettstown, and of employes of the Boonton Rolling-mill, Boonton, New Jersey.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 19, 1883.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

The Journal of proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. JACKSON presented the credentials of ISHAM G. HARRIS, chosen by the Legislature of Tennessee a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1883; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with a joint resolution of August 8, 1882, a report of a board of officers appointed to inquire into the circumstances of the loss of the exploring steamer *Jeannette* and the death of Commander De Long and other officers and men, &c.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in regard to the large sums of money annually expended by the different Indian tribes in payment of attorneys' fees for collecting money due them by the United States.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think that communication ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations. If it is what I think it is, it ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. INGALLS. Let the communication itself be read, not the note of transmittal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication will be read.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, February 17, 1883.

SIR: I deem it my duty to call your attention, and through you the attention of Congress, to the fact that large sums of money are annually expended by the different tribes of Indians in payment of attorneys' fees for the collection of money due to them by the United States. It seems to me to be without question that if the Government is justly indebted to the Indians they should not be required to pay from 5 to 50 per cent. to outside parties for collecting money honestly due them, yet such is and has been the case for many years; and it is safe to say that in the last five years not less than one-quarter of one million dollars of money belonging to Indians has been expended in this way.

If the Indians are the wards of the nation it is the duty of the Government, as their guardian, to protect their interests, and not allow \$50,000 of their funds to be expended every year for the accomplishment of an object that can be just as well done for one-tenth of that amount.

I therefore respectfully recommend that Congress be requested to authorize the appointment of an officer to be styled "solicitor of the Indian Bureau," or "assistant commissioner of Indian Affairs," or any other name that may be deemed proper, whose duty it shall be to attend, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to all cases where Indians have claims against the Government, and whose compensation as such officer shall be \$4,000 per annum; and that after such appointment shall have been made no contract shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the collection of money or the adjustment of accounts or the

settlement of disputed questions involving values of money or property in which the Indians on the one side and the Government on the other are the parties.

Very respectfully,

Hon. H. M. TELLER, Secretary of the Interior.

H. PRICE, Commissioner.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President—

Mr. VOORHEES. I was mistaken in the character of the paper. It should go to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The communication was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs asking an appropriation of \$14,000 for the purchase of stock, cattle, &c., for the Sioux Indians of Red Cloud and Red Leaf bands of Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with resolution of the 13th instant, information connected with the naval advisory board organized under act of August 5, 1882; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in answer to resolution of the 13th instant, a report of the Chief of Engineers in regard to railroad and other bridges across the Great Kanawha River in West Virginia; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of the Iroquois Club of Chicago, Illinois, prepared by Hon. Carter H. Harrison of said city, praying Congress to accept the Illinois and Michigan Canal authorized by an act of the Legislature, with a view of making said canal a national water way to the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented the memorial of E. E. Clark, mayor of Biddeford, Maine, and Benjamin F. Hamilton, and others; and the memorial of Captain N. Falkner and other shipmasters and citizens of Saco and Biddeford, Maine, remonstrating against the transfer of the Life-Saving Service and the revenue-marine service from the Treasury to the Navy Department; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSTON presented resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Norfolk and Portsmouth Cotton Exchange in favor of the erection of a light-house upon Boush's Bluff; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of Valley Prairie Grange, No. 1112, Patrons of Husbandry, Polk County, Missouri; and the petition of Frazier Grange, No. 948, Patrons of Husbandry, of Clay County, Missouri, praying for the passage of the House bill to create the office of secretary of agriculture; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented the memorial of E. C. Gates and others, citizens of Calais, Maine, remonstrating against the reduction of the duty on lumber; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Eastport, Maine, remonstrating against the transfer of the revenue marine from the Treasury to the Navy Department; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SLATER presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in favor of an appropriation of \$40,000 for further improving the Coquille River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that:

Whereas your honorable body has seen proper to grant two appropriations for the improvement of the mouth of the Coquille River, in Coos County, Oregon; and

Whereas there was put in by the first appropriation about eight hundred and sixty-eight linear feet of breakwater, which is proven to be too low, being a little above low tide, and need to be raised three feet or more, and extended further west toward the ocean several hundred feet; and

Whereas the water at the end of the present breakwater is becoming deeper; therefore requiring more rock to make the breakwater the same height, thereby proving that the second appropriation of \$10,000 will be inadequate to finish said improvement; and

Whereas the growing commerce (at times having six or eight schooners in said river) and shipbuilding (there having been built this summer two large schooners on the Coquille River) requires that there should be a good entrance at the mouth of said river; and

Whereas said valley embraces about nine hundred square miles, which is mostly covered with excellent timber and underlain with a good quality of coal, iron, stone, and other minerals; and

Whereas there are numerous snags in said river which obstruct and endanger the passage of vessels and steamboats:

Wherefore, your memorialists pray that \$40,000 be appropriated for the further improvement of the mouth of the Coquille River, and \$10,000 for the removal of snags, &c.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Adopted by the house October 9, 1882.

GEO. W. MCBRIDE,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate October 9, 1882.

W. J. MCCONNELL,
President of the Senate.

Mr. SLATER also presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, representing that the rates allowed per mile for surveying public lands in that State are insufficient to secure surveys to be made, and asking for an increase; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 9.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, would respectfully represent that the rates per mile now allowed for the survey of the public domain in the State of Oregon, which rates were established by the last Congress, are insufficient and altogether inadequate to secure the end desired, and that their maintenance must result in the discontinuance of the surveys in this State, for the reason that deputy surveyors will not contract to do the work because of the great expense of reaching the yet unsurveyed portions of the State with supplies and assistants and the difficult and expensive character of the work now remaining to be done, which is almost exclusively of that character hitherto avoided by surveyors, and for which the immediately preceding prices afforded little or no profit. The unsurveyed portions of this State consist mainly of lands lying along the coast, or on the mountain ranges, and are covered with dense forests and thick and tangled jungles of almost impenetrable brush, in addition to a ragged and craggy nature, and are generally distant from the ordinary bases of supplies. Of these facts all who are acquainted with our State are fully aware, and none more so than the deputy surveyors; yet large areas of these lands are of the richest soil; are valuable for their timber as well as other natural advantages, and are now eagerly sought for by persons in search of homes, and who are willing to clear and cultivate them. This is attested by the number of applications and petitions to the proper officers asking for their survey. These requests can not be complied with so long as the present prices prevail, for the reasons before given. The results of this condition of things are readily seen and are a matter of much seriousness to this State at this time, now that thousands are here seeking homes and thousands more are coming, the majority of whom are seeking locations upon the Government lands. That portion of the appropriation by the last Congress for the extension of surveys in Oregon is rendered useless and will necessarily be returned to the Treasury and the extension of the surveys be suspended until more remunerative prices are allowed by law. This must result to great damage to the State in preventing settlement and improvement. There is perhaps no State in the Union which is at this time attracting more attention abroad, or which is making such rapid strides in material advancement and prosperity, as Oregon; and it is safe to say that to discontinue the public surveys at this time is to strike a serious and unnecessary blow at the material prosperity of the State.

We, your memorialists, therefore earnestly ask and pray that this impediment may be speedily removed by an advance in the prices for surveys at least equal to those which prevailed before the last reduction, and that such change may at least include the appropriation to Oregon for the current year, as well as for the future. And this your memorialists will ever pray.

Rates per mile paid for surveys during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880.

	Minimum.	Maximum.
Standard parallels.....	\$12 00	\$16 00
Township lines.....	10 00	14 00
Section lines.....	8 00	10 00
Meander lines.....	12 00	16 00

Rates paid for year ending June 30, 1883.

	Minimum.	Maximum.
Standard parallels.....	\$9 00	\$13 00
Township lines.....	7 00	11 00
Section lines.....	5 00	7 00
Meander lines.....	9 00	13 00

Adopted by the house October 2, 1882.

GEO. W. McBRIDE,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate October 13, 1882.

W. J. McCONNELL,
President of the Senate.

Mr. SLATER also presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in favor of the enactment of such legislation as shall fully recognize the services of the Oregon volunteers during the Rogue River Indian war, and bring them within the provisions of existing pension laws; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 10.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that during the years 1855 and 1856 there waged in Oregon an Indian outbreak, called the Rogue River war, for the suppression of which, and the protection of the lives and property of the whites, a company called the Oregon volunteer company was raised; and

Whereas they were not mustered into the United States service, they have never been in any wise compensated for their services; and

Whereas the United States troops then stationed on the Oregon frontier were inadequate to effectually guard the said Indian frontier at that date in Oregon: Therefore,

Your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation at its next session as shall fully recognize the services of the Oregon volunteers during the Rogue River Indian war, and bring the meritorious within the beneficial action of the existing pension laws. The Senators and Representatives in Congress from Oregon are hereby requested to use all honorable efforts to secure from Congress such appropriate legislation in the premises as shall be just and proper.

Adopted by the house October 17, 1882.

GEO. W. McBRIDE,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate October 17, 1882.

W. J. McCONNELL,
President of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Hurst, Purnell & Co., and a large number of merchants of Baltimore, Maryland, praying for the repeal of all laws which impose a tax of \$200 per annum upon salesmen soliciting orders by sample in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARLAND presented the petition of Mount Grove Grange, No. 9, Patrons of Husbandry of Arkansas, praying for the creation of the office of secretary of agriculture, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAWES. I present the memorial of James Gifford and a large number of other citizens of Massachusetts, residing in Provincetown in that State, remonstrating against the transfer of the revenue marine, the Life-Saving Service, and the Marine-Hospital Service to the Navy; and also remonstrating against the establishment of a bureau of mercantile marine in the Navy Department. I move the reference of the memorial to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES. I hold in my hand a resolution which has been passed by the senate of the Legislature of Indiana and concurred in by the house, as I find by the papers. As it is very brief I will have it read.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the act of Congress providing for the payment of arrears of pensions expired by limitation before many entitled to make just claims thereunder had availed themselves of its provisions; and

Whereas many worthy and deserving soldiers have been thereby deprived of the benefits to which they are entitled: Therefore,

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein), That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to favor the passage of a law giving reasonable time for disabled soldiers or their representatives to file in the proper Department their claims for relief under said act.

THOMAS HANNA,
President of Senate.
A. J. KELLEY,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. VOORHEES. The Secretary will please read the letter of transmittal accompanying the resolution.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith senate concurrent resolution No. 8, which has passed the senate and concurred in by the house.

Respectfully,

A. J. KELLEY,
Secretary of Senate.

HON. DANIEL W. VOORHEES, Washington, D. C.

Mr. VOORHEES. I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a preamble and resolutions adopted by the Produce Exchange of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the bankruptcy bill, a portion of which provides that the sale and purchase for future delivery of the commodities of the country shall be deemed an act of bankruptcy. As the bill has been reported, I move that the resolutions lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to say, as the memorial shows a widespread public error, what has been already stated, but I will repeat it, that the bankruptcy bill, as it was reported, contains no such provision as the memorialists suppose. It merely provides that where a person is actually insolvent, dealing in "futures," so called, shall be an act of bankruptcy, it being the opinion of the committee that if a man is to indulge in that form of speculation it must be with his own money and not the money of his creditors.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The memorial will lie on the table.

Mr. LOGAN presented resolutions of the Commercial Exchange of Chicago, Illinois, in favor of the passage of a fair, just, equitable bankrupt bill, that shall be efficient and economical in its working; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLUMB. I present a petition of citizens of the State of Kansas, which I will read:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the State of Kansas and of the United States, most respectfully and earnestly pray that your honorable bodies in Congress assembled will enact the following proposition into a law without unnecessary delay:

To raise the duties on all intoxicating liquors to an average of \$16 per gallon.

I regret that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], who seems to have taken a somewhat opposite view of the propriety of a tax of that magnitude, or of any magnitude at all, is not in his seat to hear the counterpart of his proposition from citizens of my State. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB presented a petition of dealers in lumber in the State of Kansas, praying that lumber be placed on the free-list; which was ordered to lie on the table.

GENEVA AWARD FUND.

Mr. HOAR. I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent to move to recommit to the Judiciary Committee the bill (H. R. 6993) to extend the time for claimants to file their claims under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act re-establishing the Court of Commissioners of Alabama Claims, and for the distribution of the unappropriated moneys of the Geneva award," approved June 5, 1882.

I am authorized to report it back, after its recommitment, with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6943) granting a pension to the widow of the late Major-General G. K. Warren, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLUMB asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. 2492) granting a pension to John B. Childs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. 2493) for the relief of C. S. Moss; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7595) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7482) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

NEW EDITION OF SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be prepared, under the direction of the Committee on Rules, a new edition of the Manual, and that 1,000 copies of the same be printed for the use of the Senate.

HOOR OF MEETING.

Mr. INGALLS. I ask for action on the resolution I offered on Saturday with reference to the daily hour of meeting hereafter.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the daily hour of meeting of the Senate for the remainder of the session be 10 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GARLAND. I am in favor of the resolution, but suggest to the Senator from Kansas if we had better not provide at the same time for taking a recess from half past 5 to half past 7 in the evening so as to carry out the idea.

Mr. INGALLS. Even if this should be agreed to I should still think that the interests of the public service would require us to utilize all the time remaining between now and the close of next week when the session will terminate. Matters of great public importance are still pending; the tariff bill is undisposed of; great money bills are before us on which committees of conference are to act, and my impression is that 10 o'clock in the morning would be a suitable hour to meet hereafter.

Mr. GARLAND. I agree to that fully, but as we fix the time of meeting one hour earlier it seems to me we could economize our time by providing for a recess. Still I shall not insist on it.

Mr. INGALLS. My experience in my term of service here has been that when we take a recess from half past 5 to half past 7, or thereabout, great difficulty is experienced in getting a quorum on reassembling. That is a matter to be considered after this is disposed of. I take it, if it is thought best to provide for a recess of course the Senate would act on that without difficulty.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think the resolution ought to be amended so as to leave the Senate with power over the matter by adding "unless otherwise ordered."

Mr. INGALLS. This is no change of the rule. It is simply a daily order, and can be modified to-morrow if the Senate desires to do it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But the usual provision "unless otherwise ordered" is not in the resolution. In the general rule we fix the hour of meeting at 12 o'clock, "unless otherwise ordered." This makes it imperative, so that without a day's notice to amend the rule in like way it would be a standing order. I see no reason why it should be changed from the hour we are fixing so far as I can see; but I think it better to add those words.

Mr. INGALLS. Any modification the Senator suggests will be acceptable to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not object to meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning, but I should like the mover of the resolution to indicate if he has any idea about what time it is proposed the Senate shall adjourn.

Mr. INGALLS. I have no suggestion to make about it. If a quorum of the Senate choose to sit here until 10 o'clock or until midnight, I will stay with them; and if the infirmities of the flesh require us to adjourn before that time, I shall bid them God-speed and we shall adjourn, if there can not be any other method of extrication. But of course we can not fix the hour of adjournment. There are great pub-

lic matters pressing, and it is necessary to utilize all the time that can be employed between now and the 4th of March.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know that we can fix the hour, but there might be some understanding as to when the Senate proposes to adjourn. If we are going to stay here all night, I am quite willing to come and bring my blankets and stay as long as any other Senator.

Mr. INGALLS. We shall be obliged to stay here all night several nights between now and the final adjournment if we intend to dispose of the public business; but that must be left of course to the emergencies that arise.

Mr. BUTLER. I am entirely prepared to concur in that view; but I think we should do more business if we did less talking.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution as modified will be read.

The resolution as modified was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the daily hour of meeting of the Senate for the remainder of the session be 10 o'clock a. m., unless otherwise ordered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. VEST. I desire to call up the resolution I offered on Saturday in regard to the Yellowstone Park.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Acting Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. VEST February 17.

Mr. MORRILL. I have no objection at the proper time that something shall be done in relation to this matter. I shall favor it, but I shall object and do what I can to prevent the consumption of two or three hours this morning upon that subject, as it is my purpose to ask, and I hope such will be the pleasure of the Senate, to complete the revenue bill to-day before we adjourn.

Mr. VEST. I have no disposition to obstruct the consideration of the tariff bill. I am as anxious as any Senator to get through with it. If the Senator from Vermont will agree to let the resolution be taken up now and be the unfinished business for to-morrow, it will meet my purpose.

Mr. VOORHEES. There will have to be others agreeing to that. I shall not agree to it. This is a very important question; it involves very important interests and rights, and will lead to a very considerable and perhaps interesting discussion. I shall reserve any right to object to its consideration at any time.

Mr. VEST. I move, then, in order to settle the matter, that the resolution be taken up, stating at the same time that I shall not press its consideration this morning.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that during the morning hour such a motion, even if the Senate should favor it, would give him no advantage to-morrow. There is no unfinished business in the morning hour, and it would not necessarily come up. It would be quite as well to ask unanimous consent to-morrow or some other day.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope the Senator from Missouri will consent to allow the revenue bill to be completed before he brings that question up. Then he will have no difficulty in getting it acted upon.

Mr. VEST. All I want is to have it considered at some time or other. The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] is correct. To take the resolution up now and let it go over would not give it any preference to-morrow.

Mr. VEST. Very good. I shall call it up to-morrow and every day during the session.

Mr. MORRILL. I move the postponement of the Calendar, for the purpose of taking up the revenue bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The morning hour is closed, there being no further morning business. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar is postponed. The question now is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the revenue bill?

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think it necessary for public interests to have a short executive session. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

INTERNAL-REVENUE AND TARIFF DUTIES.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5538) to reduce internal-revenue taxation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD].

Mr. MCPHERSON. Before proceeding with that amendment I ask unanimous consent to withdraw an amendment that I offered on Sat-

urday to this bill and to substitute for it what I now send to the Chair, as I find my previous amendment was incorrectly drawn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator can modify his amendment. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be read. The Acting Secretary read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "further," in line 788, down to and including the word "act," in line 800, and insert:

"There shall be paid on galvanized-iron or steel wire (except barbed fence-wire and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin hereinbefore provided for) when galvanized or coated with any metal, alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatsoever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act. On iron-wire rope, and iron-strand, except barbed fence-wire, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made. On steel-wire rope and wire-strand, 2½ cents per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire from which it is made."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD], which will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. On page 91, line 2151, after the word "imported," it is proposed to insert "not more than one copy for the use of any individual, and not for sale, and," so as to make the clause read:

Books, maps, and charts specially imported, not more than one copy for the use of any individual, and not for sale, and not more than two copies in any one invoice, in good faith, for the use of any society incorporated or established for philosophical, literary, or religious purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States.

Mr. PENDLETON. The Senator from Delaware was called from the city very unexpectedly yesterday and requested me to ask the Senate to pass over this amendment for an hour or two until he should be able to return. I hope it will be allowed to go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, it will be passed over.

Mr. MORRILL. I have no objection to passing it over eternally.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I want the question put on my amendment. I want that called up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. The amendment is to strike out from the beginning of line 725, on page 34, to and including the word "pound," in line 740, and in lieu thereof to insert:

Steel ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, and slabs; die-blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; bands, hoops, strips, and sheets of all gauges and widths; plates of all thicknesses and widths; steamer, crank, and other shafts; wrist or crank pins; connecting-rods and piston-rods; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes, or blanks of sheet or plate steel, or combination of steel and iron, punched, or not punched; hammer-molds or swaged steel; gun-molds, not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry-sand, loam, or iron-molded steel castings, all of the above valued at 4 cents a pound or less, 45 per cent. ad valorem; above 4 cents a pound and not above 7 cents, 2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 11 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at above 11 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound.

Steel in any form, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry here. On Friday night the Senator from Ohio moved to strike out the lines from 573 to 581, and subsequently added lines 582 and 583, which lines read:

Steel ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs, made by the Bessemer, pneumatic, Thomas-Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin, open-hearth, or by any other process except the crucible process, and not exceeding in value 2 cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; exceeding 2 cents and not exceeding 5 cents per pound in value, 1 cent per pound; and all such steel exceeding in value 5 cents per pound shall pay the rates of duty prescribed in this act for crucible cast-steel.

Iron railway bars, weighing more than twenty-five pounds to the yard, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound—

He offered an amendment to strike out these lines. I do not know what has become of it. I should like to hear.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. BECK. I want to know what has become of the first amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. The amendment is shown in the RECORD of yesterday, on page 73, to strike out from line 725 to line 740 and insert, that is the amendment pending. As a matter of course the lines to which I proposed to apply the amendment leave words on the lines from 573 to 581 which ought to be stricken out, but I propose to insert my amendment in a place that seems to be better.

Mr. BECK. Am I not correct in saying that the motion upon which the Senate adjourned on Friday night was this amendment with these two lines included:

Iron-railway bars, weighing more than twenty-five pounds to the yard, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound—

and there was no disposition ever of that amendment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate on Friday night did adjourn on that, but the Senator from Ohio on Saturday modified his amendment and withdrew that one.

Mr. SHERMAN. I modified it, and here is the record of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROLLINS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. BECK. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported. The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out from line 735 to the proviso in line 740 and to insert.

That is the amendment that is pending.

Mr. MCPHERSON. May I inquire of the Senator from Ohio if the present amendment does not contemplate striking out from line 573 to line 581, inclusive?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir. If this amendment is adopted, as the Senator from Vermont thought it was better to put it in this place in the bill, I propose to strike out the words proposed to be stricken out by me by my first amendment.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The original amendment contemplated striking out both of these schedules.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, if I understand him aright, is to substitute for both of these schedules what now has been read.

Mr. SHERMAN. That and the subsequent one also. It is a substitute for the three clauses. There are three clauses embodied in one by this amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Ohio to withdraw for a moment that part of his amendment which contemplates striking out lines 801 and 802. He can make that motion afterward. I refer to this part of the amendment:

Steel, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator from Iowa wishes a separate vote on that proposition, and it will be more convenient for him, I will withdraw it, and will have a vote taken on the main proposition, but I will follow it with that.

Mr. ALLISON. So I understand. I would rather have a separate vote.

Mr. SHERMAN. Indeed I preferred to offer the three separately, but others suggested that I offer them together. At the request of the Senator from Iowa I modify my amendment by dropping out the last two lines; and I shall move them separately afterward if the first proposition prevails.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio modifies his amendment by leaving out the last two lines—

Steel in any form, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BECK. That is to be offered, I understand, subsequently.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BECK. That is a proposition to divide the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is about the amount of it. It is a division of the question.

Mr. BECK. I think I understand the full purport of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio now. The motion upon which we adjourned on Friday night was the one which I read from the RECORD, to strike out lines 573 to 583, inclusive, the last two lines I suppose being merely proposed to be stricken out for the purpose of getting clear of the parliamentary difficulty; and on Saturday morning, as the Senator has just read, which I had not seen, but I have seen it in the RECORD since he read it, I find that the Senator stated:

This in lieu of all amendments I proposed to offer.

That is the proposition now pending; but nothing was said, so far as I observed, about the other.

Mr. SHERMAN. That amendment was read to the Senate at the request of the Senator himself.

Mr. BECK. If that is adopted we shall turn back to strike out the other lines, I understand.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECK. So that the whole question is now practically before us. I am not going to take any time to debate it now. I have looked over it since Saturday, and I will state how I understand this amendment will leave the bill if adopted. The clause as to "steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act" is to be delayed for a few minutes, but it is part of the amendment. Steel not otherwise provided for under the existing law now pays 30 per cent. ad valorem. Under that the importations for the year 1882 amounted in value to \$5,742,512, and the duty paid was \$1,723,352. The Senator from Ohio now proposes to increase this tax to 45 per cent.

If the same value of imports continue, the duty that he proposes to impose would be \$2,584,930, or an increase of duties on the same value of goods of \$761,578; and of course all the product of this country, which is perhaps six times as much as the imports, or perhaps ten times as much, will be increased in the same ratio. In other words, 50 per cent. is to be added to the duties now imposed by law, by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, upon all steel not otherwise provided for in this act which is consumed in this country, whether made at home or abroad.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield now for a question for information?

Mr. BECK. I will.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is not that owing to an imperfect enumeration in the existing tariff law and not the bill before the Senate? Do we not provide for a more perfect enumeration and thereby cover at least 75 per cent. of the article imported under this provision heretofore? The enumeration of the present bill is more full, more precise, and covers mainly, as I think we intended to cover, the hitherto enumerated articles. Then it can not have quite the effect it has had during the past year.

Mr. BECK. There might not be as many goods imported the first year as are now imported under the clause not otherwise enumerated, but a great many new things have been discovered since the last tariff. Every day and every year new articles of steel and iron are being discovered, new processes are being invented. Since the Bessemer-steel process was first patented there is the Siemens-Martin and other processes which have changed the character of the products of the steel industry. Steel and iron are now classed together, and the commission acted upon them as if they were all one. These changes of processes and inventions are still going on. Whether anything will be added next year or the year after we can not tell, but the fact remains that upon steel not otherwise provided for the proposed increase of duty over the present law is 50 per cent.

We have professed all along that we were going to reduce the rates of taxation under existing law. The Senate did not reduce taxes now imposed in that paragraph, but allowed it to remain as it is now at 30 per cent., thinking that was as low as perhaps was proper, all other things considered. Now, after the Senate in Committee of the Whole had agreed to that, and after the Senate had agreed with the Committee of the Whole, a proposition is made to increase it 50 per cent. That means to add to every article of steel that we have failed to name and fix a specific rate of duty upon 50 per cent. more duty than is now imposed, and that is called a bill to reduce taxation, and that is done though the commission gave no intimation that they proposed an increase or any change except a general decrease on an average of 20, 30, 40, or even as high as 50 per cent. That is one of the effects of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

We summoned Mr. Oliver before us to tell all about this schedule before we went through it in the Committee of the Whole, and gave him the privilege that no other man had, to argue his own case before the committee, and to publish it and lay it on the desks of Senators and have it read for the purpose of influencing them; and yet, with all that, the schedule drawn by himself or drawn as he said by careful men, drawn by Pennsylvania iron-masters whose names I could give, for they have told me that he left the drawing of the schedules to those who knew most about it, the Senate after full discussion, first in Committee of the Whole and then in the Senate, adopted the rates now in the bill; and yet it is sought to upset them all, to add 50 per cent. to the present rate of duty on unenumerated steel and change the classification of crucible steel and Bessemer steel and steel made by different processes, to throw them all into one and add greatly to the rates, and the people are to be more heavily taxed when that is done. Yet we are told that this must all be done so that the bill may be made to correspond to what the House has done, because, forsooth, the House action is wiser and better than anything that has been done in the Senate. That is the argument and that is the avowal, and if these orders are not obeyed the bill is to be defeated.

I had given notice time and again in the course of the proceedings in Committee of the Whole that I would move amendments in the Senate to certain clauses in regard to cotton goods and woolen goods and to the flax and iron schedule, because the rates were too high; but when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] expresses his anxiety to get this bill over to the House as soon as he could, so as to give them time to consider it there, telling us that the 4th of March was rapidly approaching, I withheld every amendment I had prepared except one or two to correct manifest errors, so as to get the bill through and let the House have it, and let them do with it what they in their wisdom thought best and send it back with their amendments. For a week we have been struggling to get the bill over to the House, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who also gave notice that he was going to ask a separate vote on each item, on appeals made to him by myself and others, and at the request of the chairman of the committee, withdrew his request, so as to get the bill over to the House and give them a fair chance to examine it. We have thrown no obstacle in the way, and I avow I am ready this minute to vote for the third reading of the bill, and I believe a majority of the Senators on this side of the Chamber will vote for the third reading of the bill at once and give it to the House this morning. But if we are going to upset all the schedules, and the very men who urged us to arrange the iron schedule as it is now arranged in the bill are going to upset it, then the different amendments I had given notice that I would propose to the metal schedule, to the cotton schedule, to the glass and the other schedules I shall feel inclined to offer, and other gentlemen will of course offer their amendments.

If the gentlemen on the other side are determined to kill this bill, as they avow that they will unless they can pass it as they please and upset all that has been done in the iron schedule, let them kill it and take the responsibility. I am glad that telegrams were put in the RECORD

from Henry B. Payne and others. The country will understand the force and value of that kind of clamor. One says:

We deem it very important to our iron and steel interest that the Senate bill in its present form do not pass.

Another, signed by Mr. Mathers:

I hope you will vote against passage of Senate tariff bill. It is better to let both Senate and House bills fail than to have such a tariff.

On arguments like these all the action of the Senate is to be upset and overthrown at this late hour, within twelve days of the closing hour of Congress. I do not complain; I have done my best, and intend to do it, to get this bill over to the House in some decent shape. I have withdrawn every objection and I have been willing for a week to allow it to pass this body. But if we are to add 50 per cent. to the duties on steel, adding not only \$761,000 to the duties of last year, but six times that much, because they avow that the object is to put up the prices to consumers of all these goods, not only on the imports but on all manufactured in this country, perhaps not one-tenth is imported; so it will amount to many millions in addition.

Then let us see what we have done in the lines that are to be stricken out if this amendment is carried. First, as to Bessemer steel by the different processes, and not exceeding in value 2 cents per pound, we have fixed the rate at five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; "exceeding 2 cents, and not exceeding 5 cents per pound in value, 1 cent per pound; and all such steel exceeding in value 5 cents per pound shall pay the rates of duty prescribed in this act for crucible cast-steel."

That is all to be stricken out, and the lines that were read this morning, lines 725 to 740, are also to be stricken out, and the language used by the Senator from Ohio inserted. I maintain that but for the amendment, which I understood was accepted by the Senator from Ohio on the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa, that it should apply only to bands and hoops and that class of goods not otherwise enumerated, it would have applied to a very large class outside of that. I think no man can doubt it. After you come to the first semicolon the other is a separate and distinct paragraph, and "bands and hoops and sheets of all gauges and widths," no matter whether made of steel or of iron, would have been embraced in this amendment; but the limitation suggested by the Senator from Iowa, which I understood the Senator from Ohio to accept, I agree that now limits it to the two paragraphs that he desires now to strike out. The only question, therefore, is, what is the effect of the amendments upon them? I have read one of them, five-tenths of 1 cent a pound for all not over the valuation of 2 cents; and over 2 cents in value, and not exceeding 5, 1 cent per pound, and where the value exceeds 5 cents per pound the same as crucible cast-steel, which is 2 cents a pound where the value is over 5 and not over 9. Where the value is above 9 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound.

I think the Senator from Ohio stated—I have not compared it accurately—that he proposed to follow substantially the report of the Tariff Commission, and I believe that he has substantially, though I have not looked into that carefully. This is what he has done, and what he asks the Senate to agree to. He proposes by striking out the lines first mentioned as to Bessemer steel in his amendment of Friday night to make 45 per cent. ad valorem the rate upon all goods valued at less than 4 cents a pound, to do away with all distinction between the steel made by the Bessemer process and the crucible steel, which we have kept up and were told had to be kept up, because of the greater value of crucible steel. Yet now all distinction between them is done away with, and the proposition is to add to the taxation upon the steel made by the Bessemer process, valued between 2 to 5 cents; where we make the duty 1 cent a pound when valued at 4 and less than 5 cents, he makes it 1 cent a pound more, or \$22.40 a ton. I desire to be understood as to steel made by the Bessemer processes, lines 577 to 579 read in the Senate bill, "exceeding 2 cents and not exceeding 5 cents per pound in value, 1 cent per pound."

That is the bill as agreed upon in Committee of the Whole, and as agreed on in the Senate. Now, the Senator from Ohio proposes upon all steel embraced in this class—

Above 4 cents a pound and not above 7 cents, 2 cents per pound.

Therefore his proposition is to add \$22.40 a ton on all that class of steel valued at over 4 and not over 5 cents a pound. That, I expect, embraces a large class of steel used in this country, or why the proposed change in classification? Yet we were told on Friday night that there was to be no increase on the lower grades by the amendment. I have read the lines fixing 1 cent a pound on all these steels made by the Bessemer process as agreed to in Committee of the Whole and in the Senate. The Senator from Ohio has changed the classification. Why, I do not know, except to suit the iron masters. He has changed it so as to put \$22.40 a ton additional upon all that class of Bessemer steel that is valued not above 5 cents and above 4. Why that was done perhaps he can explain.

What next does he do? The Senate bill in the lines that he last proposes to strike out as to crucible cast-steel, ingots, and these other matters, makes this provision:

Crucible cast-steel ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, &c., valued at 5 cents per pound or less, 1½ cents per pound.

The Senator from Ohio promises whenever it is valued at over 4 cents to make that crucible steel pay 2 cents per pound, so that on that

class of goods he adds \$11.20 per ton; and on all that is valued between 4 and 5 cents a pound by a change of classification, \$22.40 per ton on the lower grades of Bessemer steel by striking out the lines he first proposed to strike out; and now by the lines he last proposes to strike out and the valuation that he puts and the tax he imposes \$11.20 a ton on all crucible steel valued between 4 and 5 cents per pound. That is the next step.

What next does he do? The Senate provided that upon all crucible cast-steel valued at 5 cents and not above 9 cents per pound, the tax should be 2 cents per pound; valued at above 9 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound. That is the maximum with only two classifications above 5 cents. What does the Senator from Ohio propose? On steel valued at from 4 to 7 cents a pound, 2 cents a pound; from 7 to 11, 2½ cents a pound; and from 11 up, 3½ cents a pound.

I have shown that he has put \$22.40 a ton by the change of classification on the lower grades of Bessemer steel; that he has put \$11.20 a ton on the grades of crucible steel valued between 4 and 5 cents, and he now proposes to change the duty on that valued from 4 to 7 cents to 2 cents a pound, the Senate having placed it from 5 to 9 at 2 cents a pound, he proposes from 7 to 11 to fix the rate at 2½ cents a pound. In other words, he increases three-fourths of a cent a pound or \$16.80 a ton upon all that grade of steel valued at from 7 and not more than 9 cents a pound, and there is where another large importation is made, as you will see if you look at the tables. Sixteen dollars and eighty cents per ton over the Senate bill is proposed upon all steel with from 7 to 9 cents a pound, and then he makes a classification we have not made at all, because from 9 up we made all at 2½ cents, and he makes it from 7 to 11, 2½ cents; and from 11 up, 3½ cents. So that upon all steel of all sorts valued at above 9 cents a pound he adds \$16.80 per ton.

How many millions that adds to the taxes of this people I do not know. It is all done for the benefit of a very few establishments in Pittsburgh and elsewhere, whose owners confess that they drew this bill, and who are now seeking to urge Senators to defeat it unless they add to its already onerous taxation all they want. It is the expectation of many people—I am not going to make any allusion to individual cases and I would not have done so the other night but for the fact that the Senator from Ohio lauded the provisions of the House bill—it is the belief of many well-advised people that these ironmasters are here in force. I know Mr. Oliver is here, for I happened to see him. I should like to give him another hearing before the Committee on Finance to know what this new departure means. The object of many of these people is to defeat the bill, as will be seen by Mr. Mather's telegram, or force us to obey their orders:

I hope you will vote against passage of Senate tariff bill. It is better to let both Senate and House bills fail than to have such a tariff.

Fifty per cent. is proposed to be added to all the steel not otherwise provided for, \$22.40 a ton is to be added to all the lower grades of steel from 2 to 5 cents in value, \$11.20 a ton is to be added to all crucible steel valued at between 4 and 5 cents, and \$16.80 a ton is to be added to all the higher grades by this amendment. In other words, the bill is to be made just what the iron-masters desire, so that it can go to the House and be passed by the House at their dictation, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i," and we shall have no tariff unless we consent to that. The House bill is substantially abandoned, according to rumor, waiting to see how bad, or, if you please, how highly protective this bill can be made, in order to see if it can not be agreed to by the iron-masters there.

I am not speaking about the motives of anybody, but a Senator can not go to the other end of the Capitol, can not go on the streets, can not go anywhere without being told that the very men who helped to pass this schedule in the way in which it is, giving something like decent relief to 50,000,000 consumers of iron and steel in this country, are now to be ordered by the iron-masters to take back all they have done and to impose a worse tariff on the people than even the existing law, or to defeat this bill altogether, and the House is to withhold any further action upon its bill to wait and see how bad this tariff bill can be made by the Senate for the people, and how good it can be made for the capitalists who have drafted all these provisions and who drew them to suit themselves, and have changed classification after classification in the most adroit way to prevent anybody from understanding what they have done, unless he makes careful calculations. I was astonished to hear the Senator from Ohio confess that this bill is to be beaten unless they should have their way.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I ask leave to have an amendment to this bill printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The printing will be ordered.

Mr. BECK. Let the amendment be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the proposed section 2503 and insert:

That on and after the 1st day of July, 1883, and until the 1st day of July, 1884, not more than 85 per cent. of the rates of duties which are now required under the existing laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States shall be levied and collected or paid; and on and after the 1st day of July, 1884, not more than 75 per cent. of the rates of duties now required under the existing laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States shall be levied and collected or paid.

Mr. BECK. That is a great deal better bill than we shall ever get if we do not adopt it. I will vote for it and be glad of the chance, though it would not work well in all regards. The people of the country will save untold millions if that amendment should pass as a substitute for all this performance of hiding and dodging and putting in new specifications and qualifications and altering plain ad valorem to specifics based upon ad valorem and all sorts of things that I do not believe the Senator from Ohio or any other gentleman with all the consideration he can give can tell the effect of. Here is a new classification again to be gone into to see how much more they can get out of the people. I hope that when the time comes there will be a yea-and-nay vote upon the proposition of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MCPHERSON. For one I hope there will be no disposition on the part of any Senator to defeat tariff legislation. The country has demanded tariff revision, and so far as I am concerned we shall have tariff revision at this session of Congress.

I perhaps may be permitted to state here some facts with respect to this particular schedule, which every Senator knows has been less considered by the Senate itself than almost any other schedule in the bill.

The fact which I wish to be permitted to state from the Finance Committee is this: We found the bill as reported from the Tariff Commission very much confused. A sub-committee was appointed, representing the most radical elements of the committee on both sides, resulting in an agreement. That agreement is found in the Senate bill substantially. For myself, I paid but little attention to it, believing as I did that a harmonious arrangement had been reached, one that was both consistent and intelligent; and until the Senator from Ohio on Friday offered his amendments I was satisfied with the action the Senate had taken upon this schedule. Since the offering of the amendments I have become convinced—and I wish the Senators on the other side of the Chamber to hear me, and the Senators on this side of the Chamber to hear me—that in the arrangement by the committee and by the Senate of this schedule we have reduced the rates lower than they ought to be. I am sure the reductions have been too great, that they are out of proportion to the other parts of this bill. I believe the rates offered by the Senator from Ohio in his amendment are too high. I believe there is no excuse or justification for changing the classification; and if that Senator will only think—I now address myself to him—he will see how much confusion he has created by bringing into the Senate Chamber a provision for a new classification, which I confess, with all the study I have been able to give it, aided by a gentleman considering himself to be an expert, I have been unable to satisfy my own mind as to how much or how little he changes by his amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does my friend understand that the schedule I have offered is the precise schedule, word for word, debated for three weeks in the House and adopted there?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not know what the House has done; I have not been there; I have not heard any debates in the House, and I care nothing about what the House has done; but, as I said before, I am sure—and I want to impress that forcibly upon every Senator on this side of the Chamber, for I believe there is a disposition here to pass a tariff bill—I am sure the rates in the bill are too low and we can not stand them.

Mr. MORGAN. The whole bill?

Mr. MCPHERSON. No; the metal schedule. I am addressing myself particularly to that, and I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that the present metal schedule is out of proportion. It is a reduction far greater than has been made on any other industry as we have it now fixed in the bill. Now I ask Senators on the other side and Senators on this side who are desirous of securing at this session of Congress tariff revision in answer to the demand the people have made on Congress to reduce taxation, to notice my proposition. We certainly have not the time now to undertake to go over the whole tariff again. With only a few days, I might say a few hours, left in which to make legislation affecting the tariff, and as our action must be considered by another branch of Congress entirely after we get through, we have not time to make a radical disturbance now in the work we have proceeded with thus far. I propose, when the proper time comes and when the coast is clear, to offer an amendment, not to change the classification made in the Senate bill; I propose to keep up the distinction we now make between the cruder qualities of steel and the crucible steel which has been retained in the Senate bill, and wisely retained. I propose to change it in this way; and I call the attention of Senators to pages 27 and 28 of the last print of the bill. One change I propose to make on page 28, line 576, is to make it read:

Except the crucible process, and not exceeding in value 5 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

In other words, I strike out the classification of all below 5 cents and make that a classification by itself, and I retain the language after the word "pound" in line 579:

And all other such steel exceeding in value 5 cents per pound shall pay the rates of duty prescribed in this act for crucible cast-steel.

I take the higher grade of crude steel as this bill proposes to do and place it above the crucible steel where it belongs as to rates. What is the effect of it? It throws out all these confusing classifications, and from my figuring the rates to-day upon these two classifications

range between 52 and 40 per cent. I make it all 40 per cent. It is a reduction from the present tariff on some values. On some it is now 52 per cent. and on others it runs down to 40. I change that and make it all 40; no Senator can be confused a moment, for I retain the existing classification, and I show that I make a reduction.

Go further; turn to page 34. I do not propose to change the existing classification of the Senate bill at all. Now, take line 737. The Senate fixed the rate there at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; I propose to make it $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. That is an increase on the Senate bill of one-half of a cent a pound and it is a reduction on the existing tariff of one-half cent a pound. No Senator can fail to understand that. I go on to the grade valued at not above 9 cents per pound; I put $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound duty. That is an increase above the present rate in the Senate bill of a quarter of a cent a pound, and it is a reduction of one-half a cent a pound from the existing rate.

I go further. Valued at above 9 cents per pound I put the rate at $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. That is an increase of half a cent a pound above the Senate bill and a decrease on these finer grades of steel of a quarter of a cent per pound from existing rates.

I propose to make no change whatever in the classification as set forth in the Senate bill, but to raise the rates slightly above those proposed in the Senate bill and make a compromise between what I believe to be too low a rate as fixed in our bill and too high a rate as proposed by the Senator from Ohio. By this there is no confusion whatever as to classifications; but a plain, simple statement capable of demonstration shows that it does reduce the rates and that the reduction corresponds with the reduction made on other industries. It is an increase above what we have already agreed on; but it is an increase by way of compromise. I think that the Senators on both sides should accept it as an intelligent and proper compromise and a consistent one. Let us vote for it. Let us complete this bill and send it to the House of Representatives, so that the House may take action upon it as promptly as it can.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I promised to answer the inquiries of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], but I see that he has been conning over the statute himself and probably has been enabled to answer himself. Is there any point on which he desires me now to answer any question in regard to the present tariff, or whether this is an increase or not? I do not wish to avoid giving information, and yet I do not want to consume time unnecessarily. If the Senator is satisfied, I shall say nothing.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think I am not alone in saying that it is next to impossible, as I said on Saturday, for any one not an expert in this series of changes of classifications to make a comparison. I have been looking at the matter somewhat, but I can not tell just how much the Senator's amendment reduces or increases certain classes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish only to occupy enough time to answer the questions put to me and make myself understood, not for the purpose of repeating.

The present law in regard to steel is as follows:

Steel in ingots, bars, coils, sheets, and steel wire, not less than one-fourth of one inch in diameter, valued at 7 cents per pound or less, 2 cents and one-fourth per pound.

At the time that law was made there was no such thing known to commerce as a steel bloom, nor was a steel rod mentioned in the tariff-list. They were nowhere provided for. At that time the Bessemer process and the various processes mentioned in the previous section were unknown. At that time nearly all steel was formed as crucible, made in small pots, a very expensive article; but the revolutions made by the change in processes brought into the commercial world what are called steel blooms, which might be said to be steel pigs, blooms, castings of steel. They were not provided for in the law. When after Bessemer had made his discovery these steel blooms in large masses were brought into this country, the question came up in the custom-house as to what rate of duty should be charged upon them. Upon examination of the law it was found that nowhere were blooms named. Then they looked to the other classifications of the law and they found two, of which one was:

All manufactures of steel, or of which steel shall be a component part, not otherwise provided for, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

After examination it was determined by the Treasury Department that that rate should be put upon these blooms, and that rate was levied, until finally it was contended by some sharp importer that these were not manufactures of steel, they were steel itself not otherwise provided for, and they claimed that these blooms came in under this classification:

Steel in any form not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

If they were classified as steel described in the tariff as ingots they were $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, which was probably on this class of steel over 100 per cent. ad valorem; if classified as steel blooms, as manufactures of steel, they were subject to a duty of 45 per cent.; if classified as steel not otherwise enumerated they were put at 30 per cent. This confusion has existed from that time to this, so that the courts and custom-house

officers and the importers are in constant collision and contest over the tax on these goods when they are imported.

The Senate would see, therefore, that if the duty is placed at 45 per cent. on blooms, with blooms already as they are to-day, I think, about \$22 a ton, it makes something like between \$9 and \$10 per ton for blooms. If they are imported as steel under the general clause as steel in ingots the rate would be over \$40 per ton; if imported under the rate of steel not otherwise provided for it would be \$6.60 per ton. This uncertainty rests upon the whole business at this moment.

When the Tariff Commission took up this subject they endeavored to classify all the cheaper forms of steel into one grade, and to place upon that kind of steel a low rate of duty, so that the people might have the benefit of cheap steel. This form of Bessemer steel not only includes steel rails, but includes iron fence, iron wire, and a multitude of articles which enter into daily use among all classes of people. Therefore the Tariff Commission, wishing to give to the people the benefit of this reduction in the value and price of steel, put upon that form of steel a duty of six-tenths of 1 cent a pound, which is about \$13 a ton; but the Committee on Finance did not understand the classification proposed, they did not understand why this low rate of duty should be applied only to an ingot or bloom weighing five hundred pounds or upward. It was said it could not be used in that form, that the ordinary blacksmith or mechanic could not import and use the bloom in that form, but that it must go through the rolling-mill, and therefore that such a classification was objectionable. But this was the only way in which the commission could separate the cheaper form of steel from the higher grades of steel, which were always in the form of small crucible cast-steel, ingots and the like, and in the smaller forms.

Here was the difficulty: The Committee on Finance, not one of whom were experts in this business, undertook to revise the action of the Tariff Commission. We could not understand what they meant and we struck out the classification that they had arranged to separate the line between the two classes of steel. We reported the bill with the rate of duty standing at six-tenths of 1 cent on all steel under 2 cents and on other grades above that. The Senate, without debate, without knowledge of the difficulties of classification, upon the motion, I think, of the Senator from Kentucky, struck that down to five-tenths of 1 cent. If I am wrong about it the Senator from Kentucky will correct me; but I think that one of his numerous amendments to the iron schedule—if he did not somebody did—was to strike it down to one-half a cent.

Thus steel which under the existing law was intended to be taxed at $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound was reduced to one-half of 1 cent a pound, and then a higher rate was imposed on steel worth more than 2 cents a pound; but as all this cheaper form of steel, except that made by the Martin-Siemens process, comes mostly under 2 cents, and all of it under 4 cents a pound, it would cover nearly all the steel imported. A low rate of duty like this would close up every crucible and Bessemer-steel works in the country, and this valuable process of making steel would be driven out of our country.

Do Senators understand what has been done in Committee of the Whole with the iron schedule? The Senator from New Jersey has at last found out that the reductions were revolutionary. I have here a table to show the nature, character, and extent of these reductions, and I am quite sure that the Senate, who no doubt will deal with this industry as they do with others, will see that, probably in ignorance, without full information, we have struck at these great industries a blow which we have not aimed at any other or pretended to aim at any other. Let us see. Iron ore we have reduced from 20 per cent. ad valorem to 50 cents per ton, although under the old rate 500,000 tons were imported. Iron in pig we have reduced from \$7 a ton to \$6.50. Scrap-iron, gathered up all over the world, we reduced from \$8 a ton to \$6.50; scrap-steel from $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound to \$6.50 a ton; steel blooms from 45 per cent. ad valorem to one-half a cent a pound; other steel from $2\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{1}{2}$ down to one-half of a cent and to 2 cents a pound. Iron railroad bars we have left the same; steel railroad bars we have reduced from \$28 a ton to seven-tenths of a cent a pound, or \$15.68 a ton.

Bar-iron we have reduced from 1 cent per pound, or \$22.40 a ton, to \$18 a ton, and on the second grade of them from \$33.60 a ton to \$22. Round iron we have reduced from \$28 a ton to \$24.80. Plate iron we have reduced from \$33.60 to \$22.40 a ton. Tin-plate, which is the highest form of iron introduced into this country, we have actually reduced from \$24.50 to \$22.40, although its proper rate would be about \$44.50. So with hoop-iron; so with other classes. The whole grade of cast-iron, of which there are thousands I may say, yes, millions of tons imported, we have reduced from \$33.60 down to \$22.40; fish-plates from 2 cents a pound to $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound; spikes and anvils from $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents to 2 cents a pound; chains from $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 cents down to $1\frac{1}{2}$ and 2 cents; circular saws from 35 per cent. to 30 per cent. ad valorem, and so on. I will not go through the list further.

Now, is it right, is it just that this industry, so large and so great, carried on mainly in the Middle States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, representing a production of \$300,000,000 per annum, should be unduly selected to strike at this fatal blow? The Senator from Kentucky says that I was present when this was done. I did not consent to it; I resisted from the very initial point the reduction of duty on pig-iron; but, as a matter of course, when the Senate reduced that

on the arguments which were presented here I felt disposed and, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I did join in making bar-iron stand on the same relative footing, believing, however, that by showing the effect of this reduction we might cause a halt. But the Senate went on time after time upon the motions and votes of the enemies of this bill, and in the name of a revenue-tariff reform struck at the iron industry of the country and carried these amendments one by one. Many of the amendments were carried by a close party vote, sometimes one or two Republicans voting with the Democrats, and this iron schedule was knocked into pi. Now, what should be done?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield right there for a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I suppose the Senator has figured the result of his amendment. Will he inform me how much reduction his amendment is from existing tariff rates?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will, exactly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. And will he at the same time inform me whether that is in just comparison with the reductions made upon other industries?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is more than is made on other rates. Strange to say, it is more. I go back and repeat again, the rates on steel now are 2½ cents a pound to 3½ cents and 10 per cent. ad valorem added. I will again state the amendment I offer, which is not mine. I clipped it out, as I said before, from the formal action of the only branch of this Government that has the right to originate a revenue bill. I took the benefit of their counsel and wisdom, and I found that they had reduced the rates of steel and they had carefully scrutinized, as I thought, the different grades and rates proposed and had made them harmonize with each other and harmonize with the general desire to reduce taxation.

The present duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem only applies to steel blooms, while all other forms of steel, however cheap they may be, are subject to the old tax of 2½ cents a pound. My amendment, or rather the House amendment, reduces all the cheaper forms of steel, whether made by the patent processes or by any other processes worth less than \$88 a ton in the market, to an ad valorem of 45 per cent. As to all these classes of steel it reduces the rate to the same rate that is now applied only to steel blooms; all are put at 45 per cent. This is an enormous reduction. All the low grades of steel that come into the country pay to-day 2½ cents a pound, except only steel in blooms. This bill proposes to put all forms of the steel worth less than 4 cents a pound at the low rate of duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. HAWLEY. When the Senator says "this bill" he means his amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, my amendment. I am speaking of the clause taken from the House bill and offered as an amendment. Here is an enormous reduction. On every item of the schedule, and we retain the old schedule, there is a reduction from the existing law of one-half of a cent a pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem. The proposition I submit throws off the 10 per cent. ad valorem, and the Senate will see that on all the grades of steel that are here enumerated there is a reduction below the present rates.

I say now without fear of contradiction that taking the whole schedule together there is a reduction proposed by my amendment of from 10 to 20 per cent. ad valorem; not 10 to 20 per cent. on the amount of goods imported, but 10 to 20 per cent. of the amount of duties now raised. The Senate will see that is a quarter of a cent from each of the grades above the lower grades, though the great reduction is in putting an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent. on all steel worth less than 4 cents a pound.

The Senate now, which is in a considerate mood, certainly can have no interest in the world to do injustice to any section. We have in this bill protected every interest of every section of the country whenever demanded. We have given to whisky over 100 per cent. protection. We have given to tobacco over 100 per cent. protection, and we increased this largely at the demand of the Senator from Kentucky. We have provided for every interest. We have increased the duty on cotton manufactures where the Senator from Rhode Island thought it important and essential to do so. We have increased in some cases the duties on wool. We have provided for the lead-pencils, the files, and all the little industries that were presented to us, upon the principle that we ought to live and let live. We have done this without respect to locality.

I, like the Senator from Illinois, have voted for every proposition that has been here offered and sustained by reasonable argument, to protect any industry, great or small, however insignificant it may be. We provided for the buttons, the thread, and all forms of industry of that kind. We have been careful not to unduly reduce the rates on any article where a Senator rose in his place and gave good reason why it ought not to be reduced. We have cared for the rice in the South cultivated by negro labor, and I voted for it because I did not want to reduce the opportunity of those people to earn a livelihood. In every respect, in every question that has been presented to the Senate, I have voted for that provision which would protect the labor of any portion of the people of this country. Yet now, when we ask you not to strike down this industry, which I may say is the center or foundation of the manufacturing industries of the Middle States, our voice is not heeded. We are not represented in this body according to our population. We are in the House. The four States, New York, Penn-

sylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, and, I might add, Virginia as well, whose interests were sacrificed in the first vote on this metal schedule, have not Senators here in proportion to their numbers.

Therefore I have a right to ask the other Senators from States that have been protected by the provision of this bill not to sacrifice the interests of these States, especially here in this body, where equal representation of numbers does not prevail. All I desire is that no injustice be done to any section, that no criticism be made of the action of any Senator, but that the same rule be applied to the industry of iron and steel as to cotton or wool. I have no personal interest in either, and care only to deal fairly and equally with all of the industries of my country. I say that from one cause or another this industry has been unduly dealt with. The Senator from New Jersey himself has at last found it out, and if there can be a fair and reasonable readjustment of the metallic schedule upon a basis of a reduction of about what is made on other articles, I should be very willing to vote for it.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator from Ohio bear with me just there for a moment? The reductions that I propose to make, if the Senator from Ohio would be so kind as to withdraw his amendment and allow me to press mine, would be a reduction on some grades of about half a cent a pound. It is an increase above the present bill of a quarter of a cent a pound upon the crucible cast-steel.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not think the present bill is a test or guide at all.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It is a decrease from existing rates upon the lower grades of steel from 52 per cent., the same grades running down from that to 40, placing them all at 40. Therefore, the classification having been retained, there is no confusion in my amendment as to classification; every Senator can see it is a reduction, and every Senator can see it is an advance beyond the present bill, which I believe to be too low.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will discuss the Senator's proposition now, although it will come up more properly when in order to put it. Instead of 45 per cent. on steel worth less than 4 cents a pound, he proposes to make the limit 5 cents. It is not at all necessary to make it 5, because all say that all the forms of steel such as we are dealing with now in the first clause of the schedule would come in under 4 cents, and that nearly all of them will come in under 2 cents. Therefore when you get above the range of 4 cents you enter upon the article of crucible steel, which is much more valuable. Let me answer further. Why reduce it to 40 per cent.? Why not 45 per cent.? At 45 per cent. there is a large reduction upon the present duty. Why reduce it more?

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will bear with me, he at the same time changes his classification. He asked me why I make it 5 cents. In turn, I might ask him why he makes it 4 cents.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer you.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I have continued it at 5 cents because the present law makes it 5 cents.

Mr. SHERMAN. I beg pardon.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senate bill makes it 5 cents.

Mr. SHERMAN. The present law does not make it 5 cents, it makes it 7 cents. At the time when the law was passed there was very little steel of less value imported. Here is the trouble. Forty-five per cent. is a large reduction. That is admitted on all hands. Now I hope Senators will see that as the 45 per cent. now only applies to steel in blooms, one single kind of steel, 45 per cent. is now extended to apply to all the other cheap forms of steel under 4 cents.

Mr. PLUMB. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask the Senator if the rate of 45 per cent. proposed by him is not an increase of about 50 per cent. on the duty now charged on the rods out of which wire fence is made?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is in a specific clause, but not included in this, I think.

Mr. PLUMB. It does not affect that?

Mr. SHERMAN. This does not affect it. I do not know whether the bill does or not. I think there is a special rate for that. I do not know what it is.

Mr. PLUMB. Is not that affected by your proposition?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think not. [To Mr. MORRILL.] Is it?

Mr. MORRILL. No.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Vermont says it is not.

Mr. PLUMB. I am not speaking of this particular amendment. I am speaking generally of the amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio to this schedule.

Mr. MORRILL. It will not be if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa shall be accepted by the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Ohio offers to accept it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I had reference to the Tariff Commission report, and not to the existing law.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thought the Senator was mistaken. The Senator asked me why I take 4 cents. I take that, first, because 4 cents would include all the cheaper forms of steel; and I take it because the House of Representatives have adopted that value as the line between specific and ad valorem rates. The amendment I offer fixes specific

rates on all steel valued above 4 cents. I have kept the old classification under the old law, which has been construed over and over again, and have reduced the rate on every one of them one-quarter to one-half a cent, which is more than 10 per cent. of the amount of duty levied under those classifications.

It seems to me that this proposition has the advantage over the proposition of the Senator from New Jersey in this, that it has already been considered in all its forms. His would have to be debated over again and studied. Nothing is more difficult for any Senator not experienced in these mechanical employments or trades, not familiar with the different grades of iron and steel, and all the technical terms applied in their manufacture and use, in a deliberative body like this, composed of lawyers, to deal with this question. Therefore, when the Tariff Commission reported I preferred to take their report, and I would prefer to take it to-day. Now, when we can fall back upon the well-considered action of the House of Representatives, I prefer to take their action rather than to take the crude suggestions that may now be offered by any single Senator, whose opinion in other matters might be entitled to the highest consideration.

If this amendment is adopted there will be a reduction of duties on all forms of steel. I intend, then, if I can, to persuade the Senate if possible to make some reasonable changes in regard to the iron schedule that would have no connection with this amendment at all. I hope in that way we may have a bill that will be satisfactory to our people and satisfactory to the whole country.

Mr. COKE. I desire to ask the Senator from Ohio if the action of the House to which he refers is not practically the same with that proposed by the Tariff Commission?

Mr. SHERMAN. The proposition I make.

Mr. COKE. On the metal schedule?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; it is much lower than the Tariff Commission, as I believe.

Mr. COKE. Are not the classifications the same?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, the classifications are not the same. The Tariff Commission reported a classification based upon the size of the ingot. Under the Tariff Commission classification no steel except an ingot or bloom weighing over five hundred pounds and of certain dimensions had the benefit of the lower rate, while this proposition gives to all kinds of steel worth less than 4 cents per pound the reduction to the ad valorem rate; and on account of the great fall in the price of steel the ad valorem rate is a much less rate than the specific rate under the old prices.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, one question that I desired to ask the Senator from Ohio has been answered just now. I did not quite hear distinctly. I believe he was asked whether this is below the Tariff Commission report.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, I am quite sure of that. Let me say now, as I do not wish to be here misrepresented about this matter, that is upon the assumption that steel blooms are worth to-day \$22 per ton. The Senator will see that six-tenths of a cent a pound would be considerably more than 45 per cent. ad valorem. It would depend entirely upon the price of the blooms.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course no Senator expects so complex a bill as this to be precisely what he prefers in regard to every detail, even in those matters affecting his own locality. I am sure that I have repeatedly voted for changes in the tariff bill that would seem superficially to be against my local interest; but I understand perfectly well that what is one man's meat is another man's poison; that what is one man's raw material is another man's manufactured article; and that if we are undertaking anything like a general system of protection, or if we are to carry out in raising a revenue in this way the general idea of protection, we have got to consider the whole country as one State. I say I have repeatedly voted for what apparently was against my local interest, and I am quite ready to do so again. I understand perfectly well, and did when I made my few remarks on Saturday, that running over the bill as we did it was quite possible that we should make the steps of unequal height, and that some subsequent gradation might be entirely proper. I am in general satisfied with the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, and I do not think he can be reproached with increasing the duty. Certainly I am quite willing to vote for it.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky avows his willingness to report this bill at once, so that it may go to the House. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that he probably has spoken one hundred lines to my one in relation to this tariff. So far as I have been concerned, I have been quite content to have a vote upon any question after it was fully understood by the Senate, and have not intended either in the beginning, middle, or end of the discussion to procrastinate the debate by repeating the same facts and arguments over and over again.

I regret that the Senator from Kentucky is so reluctant to believe that there can be any good faith on the side of those who are in favor of protection or in favor of American manufactures. I almost believe that he is as ready as John Randolph said he was to go a mile to kick a sheep. I do not know but what if he were the only witness to see a communist throwing petroleum upon a manufactory he would forget it before the next morning, refusing to be a witness in any such case.

I desire to appeal to the good sense, however, of the Senator from Kentucky, that as he knows that if this bill is to be passed at all or if any bill is to pass, the present bill will be the basis of the law that will be enacted, therefore it is quite important that if there are any defects, any examples of gross injustice, they should be rectified here. I merely wish to have Senators state the facts about anything and have a vote upon it without much more consumption of time.

In relation to this matter of steel it was presented and informally considered by the Committee on Finance. The Senator from Kentucky was present only a part of the time. When the subject was there considered even the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] admitted it was a great improvement upon the propositions that were proposed to be stricken out by the Senator from Ohio.

So far as steel is concerned that is valued below 4 cents a pound, it is a large reduction from the existing law. Steel under 7 cents a pound is subject to a duty of 2½ cents a pound, and this would be a very large reduction. Then when you go above 7 cents and up to 11 cents the present duty is 3 cents a pound, and it is proposed by the Senator from Ohio to make that 2½ cents, and above that to make it 3½ cents, without the present addition of 10 per cent. ad valorem. I understood the Senator from Ohio to be willing to make that 3½ cents, and I so stated in private conversation to Senators on the other side. If the Senator from Ohio will consent to make the last provision 3½ cents there will be a reduction of one-quarter of a cent a pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem. Then in relation to the subsequent proviso about unenumerated steel, I would suggest as a fair compromise the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and that was 3 cents a pound. That would be, if not a reduction, no more than the present rate, and on the whole a real reduction of existing rates would be effected.

Mr. President, I only hope that we will not debate this single question all day, but that we may have a vote upon it.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is correct, I suppose, in saying that I have spoken more than he has since the consideration of this bill began; but I think he will say that since the bill came before the Senate with the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, and has been considered by the Senate, I have offered no amendments except to correct one or two manifest errors, and that I have been pressing all the time to get the bill to the other House. But when a schedule has been considered for a month the wrongs, if any, in which were developed and fully discussed before the Committee of the Whole, and it has been agreed to in the Senate, and it is now sought to overthrow all that was done, I am to be grumbled at if I am not again silent when a large increase of taxation is sought to be imposed, and changes of specifications and classifications to conceal the facts are made, I am to be told again that I am an obstructionist and that the things now in the bill were inserted by me against the will of the Senate. That sort of stuff is simply absurd. I desire and intend always to put myself right. The Senator from Ohio himself indorsed what is now in this bill, and when he says I made the motion and reduced the taxes in these paragraphs I want to have the RECORD read and the facts stated correctly.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator is certainly mistaken. When the metal schedule was read, the very first moment I could get the floor I moved to amend it, and continued moving to amend it. The Senator is certainly mistaken about that. Of course it was reported by my consent from the committee.

Mr. BECK. I will read the RECORD. When the proposition that the Senator from Ohio now seeks to strike out, as to steel ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, and so on, valued at not exceeding 2 cents a pound, six-tenths of 1 cent a pound, was read and came to be considered on the 25th of January, page 25 of the RECORD, the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] inquired of me what was the effect of the amendment. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] had explained it, and I said it was an improvement upon the present condition, that we had struck out a great many objectionable words, that it would be very difficult to understand all that was proposed about weighing over five hundred pounds or weighing under five hundred pounds. I closed my remarks as follows:

Mr. BECK. I was about to say that the word "billets," an article which is more valuable than the slabs and blooms, is also added in the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, which was not embraced in the low grade provided for in the committee's bill, and as billets are a very important article of the higher rate of value, worth more than either blooms or slabs, in that regard the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is much more valuable than the committee's bill. So far as I am advised, on looking at it pretty carefully, I am inclined to think that it is a good amendment, and I shall vote for it.

So I was content:

Mr. BROWN. I move, in place of the amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island, in line 524, to strike out "six," before "tenths," and to insert "five," making the rate "five-tenths of 1 cent per pound."

That was the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], who proceeded to say:

I think there ought to be some regard to justice and propriety in fixing the standards of tariff on the different classes of metal. We have voted with a good deal of unanimity to-day to place on all steel scrap and all iron scrap that is not more than 2 feet long a duty of \$6 per ton; and I suppose if it is 18 inches thick it would not make any difference so that it does not exceed 2 feet in length. It does not matter how fine it is or what the value of it is; we put it at \$6 per ton. If that be a correct principle, then there is no reason why we should put the ingots that are mentioned here which are worth only about three or four dollars a ton

more, or even not \$2 a ton more than some of this scrap is, at a little over double the rate. Six-tenths of 1 cent, I believe, makes \$13.44 per ton. We fix pig-iron at \$6 per ton, and steel scrap and wrought scrap at \$6 per ton. Then I think about \$10 or \$12 a ton is surely high enough for these ingots and for the class of steel that is mentioned in this particular paragraph.

I therefore move as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to strike out "six" and insert "five," making the duty five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia moves to amend the paragraph proposed to be stricken out.

The amendment will be read.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 524, after the word "process," it is proposed to strike out "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths;" so as to read:

"Five-tenths of 1 cent per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Senator from Georgia to move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island by striking out "six-tenths" and inserting "five-tenths" in his proposition.

Mr. BROWN. No; I move to amend by striking out "six-tenths" in the text. I move it rather as a substitute for the proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island. I care not in what shape we get at it so as to reach the point. I am willing to wait until the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is voted on, and will give notice of my amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I am rather inclined to join the Senator from Georgia. I think perhaps we have made too great a distinction between pig-iron and the lower forms of Bessemer steel.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. You can remedy that by raising the duty on pig-iron.

Mr. ALLISON. We can remedy it in some way, and the Senator from Georgia suggests a very good way. I suggest that he move his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that would be better.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that my amendment be voted on, and if it is adopted the Senator can move his amendment to that.

Mr. SHERMAN. Would that be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. SHERMAN. It will have to be moved now before the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is voted on. It would not be in order afterward.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to offer the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Georgia to move to amend the text or to move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BROWN. My proposition was to amend the text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN. I did not notice carefully the proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MORRILL. I think the Senator from Georgia will accomplish his purpose if he moves to amend the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BROWN. Let the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island be reported again.

Mr. MORRILL. It includes the lower class articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island will be again read.

The Principal Legislative Clerk read Mr. ALDRICH's amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I move to strike out "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia now moves to amend the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island by striking out the word "six-tenths" where it first occurs and inserting "five-tenths."

Mr. BROWN. And where the rate is 1.2 cents per pound I move to strike out "two-tenths" and to leave it "1 cent."

Mr. MORRILL. I ask for a division of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is asked for. The question will be taken first on the proposal of the amendment to strike out where it first occurs "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths."

It will thus be seen that the paragraph now so much complained of was moved and voted on and agreed to without a dissenting voice, the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio both taking part in the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. It was made with the consent, at least, of the Senator from Ohio who now denounces it, and in a few minutes afterward he made a speech which I read from the other night in which he said he joined his friend from Georgia in reducing these things, because the rates we were then seeking to place them at were right; and all we have since done in regard to pig-iron has been only to make it 50 cents a ton more than it was then. Yet this morning the Senate is told that I as an obstructionist did introduce and amend the bill so that it was not fit to be sent to the House. Every one of these amendments met the sanction of the Senator from Ohio so far as I know. So much for his reckless assertions in regard to my action.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator will do me the justice to say, if he will allow me to interrupt him, that I voted with the Senator from Georgia on the amendment avowedly, and stating at the time that I voted for it in order to put these different grades in harmony with the vote already taken by the Senate. I stated that that was my purpose, and that if I could ever get the duty on pig-iron restored I would be very glad to restore these duties.

Mr. BECK. The only change now made in pig-iron is 50 cents a ton, and yet the Senator is seeking to put \$22.40 a ton and \$16.80 per ton increase of duty on many classes of Bessemer and crucible steel by a change of classification from 4 cents to 7 cents and from 7 cents to 11 cents and from 11 cents up above the committee's rate.

More than that, to show that what was done was done with perfect consideration I turn to the House proceedings which have been spoken of so much. Mr. CALKINS, of Indiana, in the House sought to make the duty three-tenths of 1 cent, and read a letter from Indianapolis signed by Aquilla Jones, president of the Indianapolis Rolling-Mill Company, addressed to Hon. W. H. CALKINS, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 29, 1883.

SIR: The bill now before your House fixes the tariff on steel blooms at about five-tenths. I desire to impress upon you and the Indiana delegation that rolling-mills throughout the country, except the Bessemer-steel works, can not live

on a duty on this class of steel exceeding three-tenths. To put it higher than this is absolute ruin to the smaller mills in this country.

AQUILLA JONES,
President of Indianapolis Rolling-Mill Company.

Hon. W. H. CALKINS.

Bringing it down to three-tenths instead of five-tenths, and one of the immediate colleagues of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], after discussion moved to make it four-tenths, and the House did make it four-tenths, or \$2.20 a ton lower than we have done now. Then a Representative from Kansas [Mr. HASKELL] modified his amendment so as to strike out four-tenths and insert 45 per cent. ad valorem, saying that was about the equivalent of four-tenths. It will be seen that this effort now to make a great increase after what has taken place in both Houses is an after-thought brought about in order to upset the schedule which was adopted with the sanction, certainly not with any opposition from the Senator from Ohio.

What I protest against is undoing all that has been done merely because a change has come over his mind and the mind of the chairman of the committee, when the chairman of the committee announced that the committee had reconsidered this subject and made these modifications, and referred to the Senator from Delaware who is now absent as agreeing with him, about which I know nothing, and said that I was only there a part of the time last Saturday morning when they thought fit to meet. Mr. President, when the amendment was sought to be referred in the Senate Friday night I objected to the reference, and it was not referred to that committee. The amendment was not before it. I had no right to be at a private conference about it, and they had no right to decide as a committee upon it, because the Senate positively refused on my objection to allow it to be sent to them on Friday night, as the RECORD will show. Of course I was not in consultation about it, except to go into the room and say, when asked to take part, that I protested against the committee or any body of men assuming to be a committee acting upon what the Senate had refused to refer to them. I consulted the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and he advised me that he was not advised that they were going to meet, and he was not there either.

I have great respect for the opinions of the Senator from Delaware. If he were here he would speak for himself. I do not believe if the Senator from Delaware were here and saw the effect of this amendment, saw that it was an increase of 50 per cent. upon all the manufactures of steel not otherwise enumerated, that he would sanction the increase for a moment, because he never has voted to increase anything beyond the provisions of the present law so far as I recollect. He has stated on this floor, and has stated in committee time and again, that he would not in any changes of classification of these steel goods add to the rate in the present law; therefore I do not believe the Senator from Delaware would vote for it. But I am not speaking for him; I do not care whether he would or not; nor do I care what he agreed to. I repeat, when I am referred to as being absent from the committee when that was considered, there was nothing before the committee which it had a right to consider, as on the floor of the Senate the night before I had objected to their undertaking to consider it; it never was before the committee in any proper sense. Therefore the chairman might as well have left that part of his attack on me out of his speech.

I have been in committee when it was in regular session I believe as regularly as any member of the committee on either side whenever there was any subject before it. From the 5th of December to the 10th of January, until the bill was reported, I believe I was there every day; and from the time it came into the Senate I have been in my seat every day and every night, and I have endeavored to perfect the bill as well as I could; and whenever I am told on the floor of the Senate that upon these things I have been obstructive or that I have been destructive I appeal to the records to show that these changes were not only not made on my motion, but that they were made with the cordial acquiescence of the Senator from Ohio himself. In the lower House it was voted even to a lower rate than it is now on the motion of a Representative from Ohio, Mr. BUTTERWORTH, and then was placed at 45 per cent. ad valorem on the motion of a Representative from Kansas upon the ground that it was the equivalent of four-tenths, and it was contended by a Republican leader that it ought to be reduced to three-tenths on telegrams from Indianapolis. I refer to Mr. CALKINS, one of the ablest Representatives from the State of Indiana.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. If Senators will look at the last print of the bill and refer to it they will see exactly what I propose to do.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 576 it is proposed to strike out "2" and insert "5."

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator will have to look at the printed amendment. I transfer that amendment to another place, and the Senator's amendment would not be germane and proper. If the Senator will go to the desk he can put it in at the proper place. The modification striking out the limitation of five hundred pounds has been made.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed, in line 576, to strike out "2" and insert "5;" to strike out all after the word "pound," in line 577, and all of line 578 to and including the word "pound" in line 579; and, after the word "pound," in line 579, to insert "40 per cent. ad valorem."

Mr. McPHERSON. So that the clause will then read:

Steel ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs, made by the Bessemer, pneumatic, Thomas-Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin, open-hearth, or by any other process except the crucible process, and not exceeding in value 5 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Retaining the remainder of that clause, as follows:

And all such steel exceeding in value 5 cents per pound shall pay the rates of duty prescribed in this act for crucible cast-steel.

Doing away with the 2-cent classification and putting all below 5 cents in one classification at 40 per cent. ad valorem. Now go on.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is further proposed, in line 727, to strike out "and one-half" and insert "three-fourths;" in line 738, after "2," insert "and one-fourth;" and in line 739, strike out "2½" and insert "3½."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment made as in Committee of the Whole from line 573 to line 581, inclusive, was agreed to by the Senate. The Senator can not go back and amend that now.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not part of the amendment to strike out what has been agreed to?

Mr. HARRIS. The first proposition of the Senator from Ohio, if I remember aright, was to strike out that clause which had been inserted with one additional clause, but I think he subsequently modified his amendment and proposed to strike out from line 725 to line 740 and insert the proposition now before the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. But in that connection I think it was stated that he would go back to the clause from line 725 to line 743 and strike that portion out.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Ohio can explain exactly what position the amendment is in.

Mr. MORGAN. That was put in after very serious objection on the part of some Senators on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, and now he proposes, after he has stricken out from line 776, &c., to go back to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is another question.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the Chair to rule that the motion to strike out that portion of the text is in order now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. To strike out what was agreed to by the Senate is not in order. The Senator from New Jersey moves to strike out "2" and insert "5" and so on in the clause from line 573 to 581, which was inserted by the Committee of the Whole and agreed to by the Senate. That is not in order.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure the Chair's ruling is correct upon that. That ruling would cut us off from the benefit of striking out of this bill from line 573 to line 581 inclusive.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No, sir; because that is part of the text.

Mr. HARRIS. When the Senator from Ohio first offered his amendment—for his first amendment was to strike out only that part which had been inserted—the Chair ruled that that was not in order. The Senator from Ohio then moved to strike out the part which had been inserted, with lines 582 and 583 in addition. The Chair ruled, and, as I think, properly ruled, that that motion was in order because it included part of the text, which was a different proposition.

Mr. SHERMAN. But afterward—

Mr. HARRIS. Afterward the Senator from Ohio transferred his amendment, and I understand his amendment now to be to strike out from line 725 to line 740, inclusive, and insert the proposition that he has sent to the desk.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is it.

Mr. HARRIS. There is now no amendment pending proposing to strike out line 776 or any part of that paragraph.

Mr. SHERMAN. No, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. I want to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he can accomplish his object by moving an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McPHERSON. That is exactly what I was doing.

Mr. ALLISON. I know; but it can be done without so much circumlocution. What I understand practically to be the view of the Senator from New Jersey is to raise the limitation from 4 cents to 5 cents per pound, and reduce the ad valorem from 45 to 40 per cent. That is it in substance.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator can do that by amending the text, which it is in order to perfect before the motion of the Senator from Ohio is taken, or as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. He can not go back and strike out what the Senate has agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. The practical effect of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey now is, where the Senator from Ohio proposes 4 cents a pound to make that 5 cents, and where the ad valorem is 45 per cent. to reduce it to 40 per cent. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is substantially the proposition of the Senator from Ohio with these exceptions. Although it makes a difference between crucible and other steel, yet the value of 5 cents a pound is inserted, it makes no difference by what process the steel is made, whether by the crucible process or any other process.

Mr. MORGAN. On last Friday I thought this bill was about ready

to go to the other House, about ready to be engrossed for a third reading. There was no Senator on this side, as I am informed, who desired to bring forward any radical amendment to the bill, and all that was expected to be done was to make some efforts to cure apparent defects in the bill. It was understood then that the principle of the bill, the arrangement of the tariff, had been practically agreed upon by the Senate. Some Senators on this side had expressed their intention to vote for the bill because it looked in the right direction, and not because they approved of all or even of most of its provisions. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], however, was not satisfied with the bill, and has not been from the beginning upon this particular schedule. He seems to be determined to press his wishes upon the Senate for the entire reformation of so much of this schedule of metals as he thinks affects certain interests in his part of the country which he wishes to protect. The Senator has set about to amend line 569 to 572 by striking out the text of the bill, including in connection therewith an amendment which repeated the same text in precisely the same words and went on to add other provisions which he desired to have put into the bill.

Now, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] comes in after the Senator from Ohio has again modified his amendment and caused it to apply now between lines 725 to 746, and the Senator from New Jersey offers a proposition further to amend the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

It is almost a matter of impossibility for any Senator here who is not a thorough expert in the distinctions and classifications and different descriptions of iron and steel to keep up with this medley of changes and rearrangements which it is proposed shall go on here and find its results in this bill. After we have adopted the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and then the amendments of the Senator from Ohio, and have remodeled the bill so as to meet the new difficulties, it will be found that there are still other difficulties in this bill which, as I think, will be troublesome to handle. It occurs to me—I may be in error about it—that the increase in line 801 to 803 of the ad valorem duty upon "steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act," that being the basket clause of this section of the bill, an increase of the ad valorem duty from 30 to 40 per cent., brings the bill into conflict with that part of it on page 41, which reads as follows:

Manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, lead, nickel, pewter, tin, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, or any other metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

All the important machines that we use in the South, particularly those that are employed in spinning cotton, have quite a considerable quantity of steel in them. Indeed, I doubt if there are many machines of an important class made in the United States now, or that are imported, that do not use quite a quantity of steel. According to the Senator's amendment, steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act will be at 40 per cent. ad valorem. Therefore, it seems to me, we should find under the head of manufactures any machine with steel in it, at least. The steel in that machine would be taxed at the rate of 40 per cent. ad valorem, instead of 35 per cent. as is provided on page 41, from line 907 to line 911. The only request that the South has made upon the subject of the steel and iron tariff—

Mr. SHERMAN. If I do not interrupt the Senator—I do not think it will hurt his argument—I desire to suggest that the distinctions made in the tariff classification between steel and the manufactures of steel is very marked. The clause as to steel only refers to steel in the natural state as steel, and not in the form of a manufactured article; and therefore it has been held by the courts and by the Treasury Department over and over again that where steel loses its form so as to assume a commercial name as an article of manufacture, it ceased to be steel and must be classified as a manufacture of steel.

Mr. MORGAN. There are two difficulties in the way of that proposition, it seems to me.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the construction.

Mr. MORGAN. The first is that we have a provision in this bill that where an article may be classified and taxed under either of two heads it shall be classified under that which brings the highest tax. So if we find steel in a machine, it being manufactured, the duty would be 35 per cent. ad valorem, and if we find the steel outside of a machine it would come in at 40 per cent., being steel in both cases, but being present in one case in the machine and in the other outside of it, it would be taxed according to the provisions of this bill at two different rates, and therefore the highest.

Mr. SHERMAN. If steel were put in any form of manufacture for use, for instance if converted into an anvil, that would be a different form of manufacture within the clause, and unless it is covered by some specific name, as a duty on an anvil, it would be covered by the duty on manufactures of steel, and not by the duty on steel itself, because it has changed its form from raw steel into an article known in commerce as a manufactured article.

Mr. MORGAN. The text of the two parts of the bill which I am now contrasting would necessarily bring up a question of interpretation, which would have to find its way to the Supreme Court before people would be satisfied about it. Steel not manufactured, steel not made up into the parts of a delicate machine, is by this bill to bear a burden

of 40 per cent. ad valorem tax. If it is manufactured and put into a delicate machine it bears an ad valorem tax of 35 per cent. That reverses all the doctrines I have heard contended for on this floor of progressive manufactures. Take a piece of crucible steel which would come in under 40 per cent. ad valorem tax under the Senator's amendment. You work this into a machine; you make it perhaps twenty times as valuable as it was before, and it may be the chief element of value in the machine, and yet you reduce the tax according to this bill to 35 per cent. ad valorem because it is not specifically enumerated, because the machine in which the steel is wrought is not itself specially named. There is a clear inconsistency, and it shows the danger of going back in this bill and undertaking to inject into it the special views of special claimants for protection under this system of tariff taxation combined with protection.

The Senator from Ohio informed us that he had been receiving telegrams, and he has spread them upon the RECORD, from various important gentlemen, some Democrats and some Republicans; among others he referred to Mr. Payne, of Cleveland, Ohio, as being very urgent in his demands upon the Congress of the United States for the introduction into this bill of a higher rate of taxation upon steel than the Senate or the Committee of the Whole had agreed to. Now I read from the Cincinnati News what I conceive to be the inspiration of all this agitation on the subject of an increase of duty. It is under the head of

A FEIGHTENED "INFANT."

The following was received yesterday:

Hon. W. MEANS, Cincinnati, Ohio:

WASHINGTON, February 16.

Please see that strong telegraphic protests are sent to Senators PENDLETON and SHERMAN against the Senate tariff bill. The scheme is to send the Senate bill to the House and secure concurrence without reference to a committee of conference. Get iron manufacturers of Cincinnati to act promptly.

JAMES M. SWANK,
Secretary American Iron and Steel Association.

Mr. Swank is here looking over our action, supervising and superintending it, and he telegraphs out to the iron-masters and the steel manufacturers to send strong and urgent telegrams to Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. PENDLETON against the passage of the bill as the Senate has already agreed upon it, after full and deliberate discussion, and after change after change has been made to accommodate the very views presented by the Senator from Ohio himself. Thereupon telegrams flooded in and the Senator from Ohio has spread them upon the RECORD as an evidence of the agitation that this country is thrown into upon this question. The agitation all goes from Washington through Mr. Swank's telegrams out to the different iron-manufacturing establishments and steel-manufacturing establishments, and it comes back in the form of these stirring telegrams. That is the inspiration of this movement; and here the Senate of the United States, when it is ready to pass a tariff bill, and when gentlemen on this side are yielding objections to a great number of the important features of this bill, so that the country may have repose, the Senate is required to go back over its work, and day after day to reconsider its action upon this subject, and finally we have got to that condition where if we take action at all it can not be done intelligently, it can not be done with safety unless we recommit at least this part of the iron schedule to the Committee on Finance.

I only rose to call the attention of the Senate to the very involved condition of this bill upon this very important and complex subject as it is presented now in the amendments of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from Kentucky has demonstrated this morning that the proposition of the Senator from Ohio is an entire change of classification, and that it is a very large increase of the tariff upon these productions. The Senator from New Jersey, I suppose, is willing to admit that he proposes another change of classification and a partial reduction of the ad valorem rate of taxation upon this article, and I have just drawn the attention of the Senate to an apparent conflict between the bill which lets in machinery from foreign countries at one rate and this amendment which puts a different ad valorem tax upon the metal of which a large portion of that machinery is made.

In this state of doubt and confusion the Senator from Vermont is asking the Senate to move with a little more alacrity in the passage of this bill. The Senator need not address his remarks on that subject to this side of the Chamber. Those remarks have no application to our conduct here, but they do apply to the other side of the Chamber. If Senators on that side now desire to have this bill passed, if they really wish to send to the House of Representatives that which we have substantially and formally and solemnly agreed upon in the Committee of the Whole, I think they will vote down the amendments both of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Ohio. If I am able to comprehend the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, it is an improvement on that proposed by the Senator from Ohio, and I should be compelled to vote for that in the event that there was any probability of the other passing.

Mr. President, there is dissatisfaction with this bill on both sides of the Chamber, and this country will be very much better satisfied with our action if we would adopt a common-sense course upon this whole question. Take the existing tariff laws as they stand (which it must

be admitted are the outgrowth of the experience and wisdom of the Congress of the United States and of the commercial and industrial classes of this country) and pass a graduated or horizontal line through it, reducing it pro rata annually, first commencing at a reduction of 10 or 15 per cent. of the present tax, letting that operate for one year, and then going on for the next year and reducing it again 10 or 15 per cent. of the existing tax. In that way the country would be relieved of the burden of excessive taxation; the Treasury would not receive any increase to its already plethoric condition. We could then take up the tariff section by section, item by item, when we shall have more leisure to do it than we have now, and we could ascertain whether certain industries were being injured by this horizontal reduction. We could provide so that no calamity would come upon any part of the country.

Now, sir, we hear daily of iron and steel establishments going to pieces in this country. The morning papers inform us of a very important failure of a great steel and iron establishment in the State of Ohio. It is said that one of the members of that company resides in Chicago; that if that gentleman should pay to the company what he personally owes to it the company would be able to go on. That is the general statement that is made in the telegraphic advices we receive through the newspapers this morning. I of course expect that this failure and any other failure that may occur in this country will be charged upon the delay of Congress in passing a tariff bill. If it should be so charged, I for one wish to exonerate myself, and others who are associated with me on this side of the Chamber, from having delayed this bill, for we have made up our minds to send it to the House so far as our votes are concerned. That is I believe the purpose of a considerable number of gentlemen on this side of the Chamber if the bill is kept in the shape or substantially in the shape in which it came from the Committee of the Whole. That condition of the bill is now to be interrupted it seems; radical changes are to be incorporated in the bill. It is to be made a new and untried measure so far as iron and steel are concerned, and a measure that, when the Senate shall have enacted it, it will not understand.

Under these circumstances I intend to submit a proposition a little later in the day under which the Senators on this floor shall have an opportunity of doing that which they admit on all hands the people require that they should do, deplete the Treasury of a part of its revenue derived from the tariff and also from internal taxation. I will offer to amend the bill so as to cut down the existing tariff so that we will preserve to the Congress of the United States the power to rectify any evils that may befall any class of industries in this country, and provide for a further gradual reduction, extending the time over a period of two years. This plan I think will produce as little jar and disturbance in the operations of these great industries as is possible under any plan.

The country will understand then whether or not it is the real purpose of the Senate of the United States to reduce the revenue which comes into the Treasury through the tariff and through internal taxation. No doubt will remain after that proposition is voted upon. On the contrary, if that proposition shall be voted down, it will be entirely apparent to the whole people of the United States that what we have been engaged in here for the last six weeks has been a mere effort to boost up certain industries in this country at the expense of other industries and of the people at large; that we have not been engaged in a candid effort to reduce and reconstruct the tariff; that after we had reached conclusions which were substantially satisfactory all around as an experiment to be tried for the future, some of the leading gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, some who have been for a long time prominent in the political and financial history of this country, throw into this bill new features and new elements which we do not understand and have not the time to comprehend, and which radically change the whole nature of the system. That course of procedure can not be charged to us. We want tariff revision, and will not be able to get it, because those who desire a tariff only for purposes of gain will not accept the conclusions at which the Senate has arrived.

I here protest against any sort of intimation or assertion that anybody on this side of the Chamber is responsible in any way or manner or shape or form for what has been done by the Senator from Ohio in this new endeavor to reform this schedule of metals. The inconsistencies which his amendment will work are glaring; and after we have adopted it there will not be a man in the Senate, I care not what particular industry he is looking out for, unless it is the Senator from Ohio, who can write to his constituents or go to them and inform them of the precise effect of this measure upon their industries.

Why not let us send this bill to the House of Representatives as the Senate has amended it, in order that, if they are prepared to act at all upon any tariff bill, they shall have a fair opportunity of responding to our suggestions? Or shall we prefer to heed the advice of Mr. Swank which he telegraphed out to the companies he represents throughout the United States, and had repeated in urgent messages returned here to Mr. PENDLETON and Mr. SHERMAN, asking them to defeat the Senate tariff bill? It is time that we were acting and thinking for ourselves, and that we should not allow these gentlemen to disturb and agitate the Senate of the United States by this sort of manufactured thunder, this stage thunder, which they get up to indicate that there is great alarm and agitation among the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Chair understand that the Senator from New Jersey has offered his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio or to the text of the bill?

Mr. MCPHERSON. To the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 16 of the proposed amendment it is moved to strike out "4" and insert "5;" in line 17 to strike out "4" and insert "5;" in line 17 to strike out "7" and insert "9;" in line 18, after "2," to insert "and one-fourth;" and in line 18 to strike out "7 cents and not above 11" and insert "9;" in line 19, after "pound," to add "3½ cents per pound," and strike out "two and three-fourths of 1 cent;" strike out all after "pound," in line 20, and at the end insert "all crucible steel valued below 5 cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound;" so that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would read, commencing at line 15:

Iron-molded steel castings, all of the above classes of steel not otherwise specially provided for in this act, valued at 5 cents a pound or less, 40 per cent. ad valorem; above 5 cents a pound and not above 9 cents, 2½ cents per pound; valued above 9 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; all crucible steel valued below 5 cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It will be seen that I simply preserve the Senate's classification and I raise the Senate's rates to a point, as I understand it, where I am nearly midway between the Senate bill and the proposition of the Senator from Ohio. I avoid all the confusion that his new classification would engender. In amending his amendment I make provision at the end of the clause for crucible cast-steel below 5 cents a pound, which is put at 1½ cents a pound. Then it will read exactly as the Senate bill would read from line 735:

All of the above, being crucible cast-steel, valued at 5 cents per pound or less, 1½ cents per pound; valued above 5 cents and not above 9 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at above 9 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound.

It makes provision for all the crucible steel both below and above the 5-cent limit; it makes provision for the coarser grades of steel at 40 per cent. ad valorem instead of 45.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senate will perceive how difficult it is to deal with a question of this kind when I tell them, as I do without fear of contradiction, that the proposition made by the Senator from New Jersey to put all crucible steel at the rate of 1.75 cents per pound will increase the rate of duty more than all the decreases proposed by him in the course of his amendment will amount to.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Do you say this is an increase?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; because some forms of crucible steel are cheap, and they will be brought into the country and there will be no reduction. There is no reason in the world why a higher duty should be put upon crucible steel than upon other forms of steel if they are of the same value.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The same distinction is made in the Senate bill, and I have heard no objection to it.

Mr. SHERMAN. We must put a uniform rate, be it as low a rate as 40 per cent. if you wish on steel below 4 cents a pound; but let it apply to all alike.

Mr. MCPHERSON. There are different qualities of steel. I think there ought to be a difference between those qualities of steel made by the open-hearth process and the other processes that are named here of a much lower grade and crucible steel.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does not the Senator know that the duty of 1.75 cents a pound on crucible steel below 5 cents a pound in value will raise the rate of duty on more pounds of steel than his other changes will lower the duties?

Mr. MCPHERSON. As the Senator from Ohio professes to want a higher rate of duties, I do not understand how he can object to that clause of the Senate bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I want a fair duty all around. I do not want any special clause excepting crucible steel from the regular ad valorem rate if we are to adopt that rate on the lower classes.

My colleague and I represent more manufacturers of agricultural implements than almost any other four or five Senators here. These implements are largely made in our State. As a matter of course our people are anxious to get cheap steel, and if I was simply representing the interests of my own State I should speak quite differently; but I want to see a fair rate proposed on all. This excepting crucible steel from the low rate proposed by the Senator from New Jersey excites at least a remark from me that I do not see any reason why crucible steel worth less than 5 cents a pound should pay a higher rate of duty than Bessemer steel worth less than 5 cents a pound.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Simply because it is crucible steel.

Now, I wish to say that there is no Senator on this floor knows better than the Senator from Ohio that unless we reach some kind of a decision about this matter to-day or very soon, it is perfect nonsense for us to expect any tariff revision. I do not suppose that I have offered an amendment that renders equal and exact justice. I must confess that I do not know as well as I ought to know what would be equal and exact justice. I have done the best I could. I have reached the fairest compromise I can between the two discordant elements here, one I believe too low and the other too high; and certainly if we find that this

rate is a burden upon any interest of the country it will only have to wait a few months to have it corrected, because when Congress convenes again in December it is much easier to change an error or correct a fault in the legislation now proposed than it is to commence anew the investigation and consideration of this whole tariff subject.

I look upon this as a compromise. It is higher than the Senate bill, although it is lower than the Senator from Ohio's amendment. It is the best compromise I can offer. As I said before, if there is any disposition on the part of the Senate to pass a tariff bill, I would advise them to accept this compromise and let us proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. I am inclined to support a portion of the suggestion made by the Senator from New Jersey, but I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio that crucible steel, simply because it is crucible steel, should not have a higher rate than any other form of steel costing as much. If we are to make a scale of duties here graduated with reference to valuation, I do not see why we should not make it apply as well to crucible steel as to other forms of steel. The Senator from New Jersey proposes the rate of 1½ cents a pound upon all crucible steel valued at 5 cents or less, as I understand.

It seems to me that the proposition of the Senator from Ohio, with the exception of the ad valorem of 45 per cent., is a fair proposition in the main, if I understand it correctly. The ad valorem is 45 per cent. upon the lower grades of steel. I would be inclined to concur with the Senator from New Jersey on 40 per cent. ad valorem.

But now let us look for a moment at the classification suggested by the Senator from Ohio. From 4 cents to 7 cents the rate is 2 cents a pound. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to this, because it seems to me this proposition is not far from what is just and fair to the steel industry. From 4 to 7 cents a pound in no case can the ad valorem exceed 50 per cent., and if steel comes in at 7 cents a pound it is down to 29 per cent. ad valorem on the proposition of the Senator from Ohio. Then take the class from 7 to 11 cents. The Senator from Ohio has a duty of 2½ cents a pound on that; the highest ad valorem on that class is 39 per cent. Steel coming in at 7 cents a pound is only 39 per cent. ad valorem, and at 11 cents a pound it is only 25 per cent. ad valorem. So with the class above 11 cents a pound; the highest possible ad valorem duty is only 32 per cent. on that class of steel.

So when you come to the scale of the Senator from Ohio it seems to me a fair scale compared with the other items in this bill; but as to the ad valorem of 45 per cent. on all steel under 4 cents a pound, I think I would follow the Senator from New Jersey and vote for 40 per cent. instead.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Inasmuch as objection is made to making a distinction between crucible steel and other kinds of steel below 5 cents a pound, I am not going to press that part of the amendment, and therefore, by unanimous consent, I will withdraw that portion of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I can see that when you come below 5 cents a pound it does not make much difference whether it is crucible steel or by what process it is made, and therefore I withdraw that part of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I call for a division of the question in order that the Senate may vote understandingly. I ask for the yeas and nays on the first proposition to change the classification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Ohio state what division of the question he desires?

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire a separate vote on the first proposition, which changes the classification from 4 cents to 5 cents.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the first proposition indicated by the Senator.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; bands, hoops, strips, and sheets of all gauges and widths; plates of all thicknesses and widths; steamer, crank, and other shafts; wrist or crank pins; connecting-rods and piston-rods; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes, or blanks of sheet or plate steel, or combination of steel and iron, punched or not punched; hammer-molds or swaged steel; gun-molds, not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded steel castings. All of the above classes of steel not otherwise specially provided for in this act, valued at 5 cents a pound or less, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. SHERMAN. My amendment is 4 and the Senator's is 5 cents a pound. I think the Senator will withdraw that classification, for I am informed, though I have no knowledge of the value of these articles, that 4 cents will cover every pound of the kind of steel that is described in the original amendment, Bessemer and all the other kinds, and that 5 will enter on a class of steel that has always been fixed at a specific duty, and therefore 4 is the proper dividing line; and unless the Senator has better information than I have on the subject, I hope he will not insist on making it 5.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I shall not insist upon it, but I want the Senator from Ohio to agree that the vote may be taken on my classification all through without voting on each branch separately.

Mr. SHERMAN. I prefer a vote on each separately.

Mr. MCPHERSON. See how much easier and quicker we shall arrive at a decision if the Senator from Ohio will permit my classification to be voted upon as one question in lieu of his.

Mr. SHERMAN. I prefer not. This is a very important matter, and I prefer to vote separately.

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well.

Mr. BECK. Allow me to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Is there any such thing as a valuation of 4 cents either in the existing law or in any other provision?

Mr. SHERMAN. No, nor is 5; there is no valuation under the existing law below 7 cents; but under the old condition of affairs when that law was framed steel worth 7 cents a pound was, I suppose, considered a pretty low grade of steel.

Mr. BECK. The Tariff Commission suggested 5, and the Senate Finance Committee suggested 5, and we now hear of 4 for the first time, do we not?

Mr. SHERMAN. But the Tariff Commission suggested 5 as the grade of the crucible steel.

Mr. BECK. From 5 to 9.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the Senator is mistaken in regard to it. No one has ever put the classification of the cheap forms of Bessemer, Siemens-Martin, and the basic process at higher than 4. I suppose that they range somewhere between 1 and 3, and that 4 is really the proper standard. If there was any doubt about it I would not insist upon it; but the information I have, not from interested parties, is that 4 covers all the classes made by the newly-invented processes. I think, therefore, it is better to keep it at that.

Mr. BECK. That increases the rate \$22.40 a ton on all valued between 4 and 5 cents a pound, without any suggestion from anybody until now that it was the proper rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON], upon which the yeas and nays have been called for.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear the remainder of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the remainder of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. ALLISON. Beyond the point where the "4" is stricken out and "5" inserted.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

Above 5 cents a pound and not above 9 cents, 2½ cents per pound; valued above 9 cents, 3½ cents per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first part of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON], who has been called away by sickness in his family. If he were present, I should vote "yea" on this amendment. I do not know how he would vote. If any of his friends know that he would vote that way, I shall vote, but I will not vote for the present.

Mr. SLATER (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KELLOGG]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. MAXEY. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS]. If present, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. When I voted I did not know that he was absent. I withdraw my vote. I do not know how he would vote.

Mr. McDILL. I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR]. If he were here, I think I should vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]. I voted inadvertently, not noticing that he was out of the Chamber. I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—33.

Beck,	Groome,	Jonas,	Vance,
Call,	Grover,	Jones of Florida,	Van Wyck,
Camden,	Hampton,	McPHERSON,	Vest,
Coke,	Harris,	Maxey,	Voorhees,
Davis of W. Va.,	Hawley,	Pendleton,	Williams,
Dawes,	Hoar,	Platt,	Windom.
Farley,	Ingalls,	Plumb,	
George,	Jackson,	Pugh,	
Gorman,	Johnston,	Ransom,	

NAYS—19.

Aldrich,	Frye,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Allison,	Hale,	Miller of Cal.,	Sewell,
Anthony,	Hill,	Miller of N. Y.,	Sherman,
Cameron of Wis.,	Jones of Nevada,	Mitchell,	Tabor.
Conger,	Logan,	Morrill,	

ABSENT—24.

Barrow,	Cockrell,	Harrison,	Morgan,
Bayard,	Davis of Ill.,	Kellogg,	Saulsbury,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Lamar,	Saunders,
Brown,	Fair,	Lapham,	Sawyer,
Butler,	Ferry,	McDill,	Slater,
Cameron of Pa.,	Garland,	Mahone,	Walker.

So the first branch of the amendment to the amendment was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the remainder of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask for a further division, and call for the yeas and nays. I want a division as to the rate per cent., whether 45 or 40. The proposition I made was 45 per cent. The Senator from New Jersey proposes 40. I want a ye-and-nay vote on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio demands a further division of the question, so that the question will be on that part of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey which proposes to strike out "45" and insert "40" before "per cent. ad valorem," and on that demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BECK. I propose to vote for this proposition, because 40 per cent. is about the average rate of tax upon many of the goods which are enumerated, because I believe nine-tenths of the items in the paragraph now pay about that rate. Here we have—

Bands, hoops, strips, and sheets of all gauges and widths; plates of all thicknesses and widths; steamer crank and other shafts; wrist or crank pins, &c.

And going through with what are now in the paragraph unenumerated articles, some of which now pay 30, some 40, some 45 per cent. under existing law, therefore 40 per cent. will be about the average. I think 40 is much too high, yet it is better than 45, and for that reason I propose to vote for it.

I am now advised that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who speaks in a low tone of voice, a short time since made a speech in which he said in substance (though I did not hear him and have not seen the RECORD) that my malignity toward manufacturing establishments was so great that if I saw coal-oil poured over one, with the torch about to be applied, I would approve it, or if I were called as a witness would avoid appearing to tell the truth next morning. Am I correct? Because if I am I desire to characterize that as absolutely untrue and as a very malicious statement.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I will state what I did say.

Mr. BECK. I should like to hear it.

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator from Kentucky has frequently charged upon the Tariff Commission all sorts of iniquity, as wanting in good faith, and even upon some members of the Committee on Finance; and his opposition has been so fierce and so angry I may say, almost from the start, that I did say that I thought the Senator has as much hostility as John Randolph had, who would go a mile to kick a sheep, and I did not know but that if he were to see petroleum poured upon a factory and he was the only witness he would forget it before the next morning.

Mr. BECK. I repeat now what I said, that that is a malicious statement and is absolutely untrue. I have shown no malice against any manufacturing establishment or against the manufacturers of this country. I voted, when the Senator from Massachusetts sought to reduce the tax on Russian iron from 2½ to 2 cents, against him, because I thought it was too low. When Senators sought to bring in machinery at 10 per cent. or lower rates, I voted against it, thinking that too low. I have sought to bring down no tax below the point where I believed the manufacturers of this country could live and manufacture their goods. And when the Senator from Vermont makes a speech of that sort I intend to be inside of parliamentary rules, and just barely inside of them, by denouncing it in every form that parliamentary law will allow, and if I was outside of the Senate I would denounce it in still more vigorous terms.

I have endeavored honestly and earnestly to pass a bill under which the people of this country can manufacture all classes of goods. I am seeking to pass a bill whereby the consumers of these goods in this country will be able to obtain them at reasonable rates, and at the same time one that will enable the men who have to send their corn, their wheat, their bacon, their cotton, their petroleum, their everything to foreign markets shall not be deprived of the right of buying what they must have, or be taxed for doing so beyond the point requisite for the wants of the Government in raising its necessary revenue, and that the men of this country who have even been induced to build up their manufacturing establishments under a false system shall not be severely cut down or injured because of the delusion that protection protects.

When we were told that we were going to reduce this tariff at least 20 per cent., and when in the varied schedules we have increased instead of reduced, and when all the statements made by the Senator from Vermont as to the reduction on cotton goods and as to the reduction on many other things have been proven to be wholly delusive on the floor of the Senate by careful calculation, it ill becomes him to rise here and make such insinuations and denunciations of my course because I have sought in good faith to bring down taxation under this tariff somewhere near the point where the Tariff Commission said it should be, and to what it is conceded it ought to be brought.

When I say I shall vote for 40 per cent. instead of 45, I do not mean to be understood as seeking to destroy any manufacture. I have imputed no bad motives to any man on this floor. The Senator from Vermont has abandoned the bill he himself reported time and again and voted for increases of all sorts, and I have found no fault with it. Since the bill was reported from the Committee of the Whole he has hardly done anything else than seek to undo the work of his committee. He has risen in his place over and over again and talked about the time I have consumed, when he took an hour and three-quarters to deliver an old speech against the Japanese fund that had no more to do with actual business than the man in the moon, and then voted for the very thing he had denounced, and when it became important to adjourn in the evening, when it suited him or his friends to go to some entertainment that they liked, he could adjourn, but when it did not suit them, if any of us moved to adjourn at 9, 10, or 11 o'clock at night he talked about our consuming time and seeking to delay the passage of his bill; now under the pretense that his committee acted on this matter last Saturday morning, when his committee had no right to look at it at all, and when the objection was made on Friday night by me that the committee should not take it, and he conceded that the committee had nothing to do with it, he had to state that I was absent when they were considering it.

I have acted in absolute good faith. I told the committee in committee, out of committee, and on the floor of the Senate that I desired and I wish to be met by fair arguments. If I have been voting to tax anything at too low a rate it was the duty of Senators on the other side to show wherein I was wrong. I have made no tariff speech on general principles. I have consumed no unnecessary time at this session. I have been urged over and over again by gentlemen on this side of the Chamber who had not the same opportunity I had of knowing the facts in detail as we approached schedule by schedule to give them my views so they could vote intelligently; indeed many gentlemen here told me it was my duty to do so, and I have spoken on this floor at their request in order to inform them, because they had neither the time nor the opportunity to look into the details as I had; yet when I have acted in absolute good faith and I am told that I would like to see the manufacturing establishments of this country destroyed, and would absent myself from committee rather than tell the truth about it, it is a little more than I care to bear without resenting it in whatever way I can in a parliamentary manner.

The Senator from Vermont has a right to his own opinions. I have a right to mine. He will fail to find from the beginning of this debate to the end of it, either at the last session or in the present session, that I have attributed to him any bad motives or that I have failed to comply with all duties that he as chairman of the committee had a right to require me to comply with. I have been frank and open in all my avowals and in expressing my opinion and giving my reasons for so doing. That is all I care to say.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I am willing to say that I think the last expression that I made was rather rough and perhaps undeserved by the Senator from Kentucky; but I submit to the judgment of the Senate if the Senator from Kentucky has not from first to last exhibited almost an angry feeling whenever anything was said by this side of the Chamber in behalf of any industry, and if he has not rejected all information and testimony in relation to manufactures and accepted only such as he received from importers or from some other source.

From my boyhood I was educated by such Senators as used to come here from Kentucky; by Clay and Crittenden and other Senators from the South; such men as Mangum and Berrien, Bell and Stephens, and I may say by John M. Botts, when a majority of the South was represented here by protective-tariff men. Then I was in the habit of reading of something like fair play in relation to this subject, but from the beginning of the consideration of this bill by the Senator from Kentucky I do not know that he has adhered to hardly a single proposition made by the Committee on Finance. He has felt himself at liberty to propose reductions from the beginning to the end of the bill. In some instances, as I avowed I would at the outset if I found there was a large industry going to destruction or being unduly oppressed by the reductions made, I would readily change my vote and go for a larger figure.

Now, I think I have said all that is necessary to be said on this subject, and I prefer to have a vote to even my own talk or that of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McPHERSON. I only rise to call the attention of the Senate to one fact: The amendment I have offered is based upon a well-regulated and well-adjusted grade. If you disturb this 40 per cent. ad valorem which I have proposed as an amendment to the proposition of the Senator from Ohio, it will require perhaps different alterations in my amendment which I hope will not be deemed necessary. I wish to say still further—I declare it openly and I charge it boldly, I care not which side of the Chamber it hits—that with only a few hours left us, as we were informed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that can be devoted to this bill, if we now neglect to accept this fair and reasonable compromise, the side of the Chamber that refuses it, in my opinion, does not desire tariff revision or legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on that part of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment of the

Senator from Ohio which changes 45 per cent. ad valorem to 40 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. This amendment as well as the others proposed, has not been brought to my attention. I have no knowledge of this subject except what I have obtained this morning. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am entirely unable to form a judgment upon the pending propositions. I am, however, settled in my conviction that it is my duty to oppose the bill as it now stands in the Senate with whatever force I can exercise, and that in obedience to the public opinion which prevails in my State. I shall vote for the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio, as I understand they are improvements upon the rates fixed by the action of the Senate. Not desiring to detain the Senate, feeling the force of the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, I will say in justice to myself and my people, so far as I know my own feeling and their wish, that desiring that there shall be a revision of the tariff upon a basis of fair rates I shall postpone whatever I may have to say in relation to the bill as it now stands until some future time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, striking out "45" and inserting "40," on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Acting Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAXEY (when Mr. GARLAND's name was called). The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS]. If the Senator from Arkansas were not paired he would vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM].

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. BLAIR (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW], and withdraw my vote.

Mr. COCKRELL. As announced on the previous vote, I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON]. I make the announcement for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—37.

Allison,	Gorman,	Jones of Florida,	Slater,
Beck,	Groome,	McDill,	Vance,
Call,	Grover,	McMillan,	Van Wyck,
Camden,	Hampton,	McPherson,	Vest,
Coke,	Harris,	Maxey,	Walker,
Davis of Ill.,	Hoar,	Miller of Cal.,	Williams,
Davis of W. Va.,	Ingalls,	Pendleton,	Windom.
Dawes,	Jackson,	Plumb,	
Farley,	Johnston,	Pugh,	
George,	Jonas,	Ransom,	

NAYS—19.

Aldrich,	Hale,	Logan,	Rollins,
Anthony,	Hawley,	Miller of N. Y.,	Sewell,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hill,	Mitchell,	Sherman,
Conger,	Jones of Nevada,	Morrill,	Tabor.
Frye,	Kellogg,	Platt,	

ABSENT—20.

Barrow,	Cameron of Pa.,	Garland,	Morgan,
Bayard,	Cockrell,	Harrison,	Saulsbury,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Lamar,	Saunders,
Brown,	Fair,	Lapham,	Sawyer,
Butler,	Ferry,	Mahone,	Voorhees.

So the next branch of the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONGER. Is it proper now to offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the last clause of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. CONGER. I will wait until this amendment is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the last clause of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as amended on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to insert after the word "slabs," in the first line of the amendment, the words "by whatever process made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS, of West Virginia. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether this particular clause interferes with the amendment that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] wants reserved?

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is on a different point.

Mr. DAVIS, of West Virginia. I knew there was some amendment he wanted to propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the amendment.

Mr. BECK. There was an amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa on Saturday to limit this clause. I desire to hear the amend-

ment read again. I desire that bands, strips, and sheets of iron and other things shall not by possibility be included in this amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think they are covered by it.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

All descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded steel castings; all of the above classes of steel not otherwise specially provided for in this act, valued, &c.

Mr. BECK. Can that mean that these bands and hoops may be of iron or steel?

Mr. ALLISON. All in this paragraph relates to steel. It is intended to have this paragraph apply to steel alone. I think it is clear as it is.

Mr. BECK. Where the semicolon comes in they seem to be separate—"bands, hoops, strips, and sheets of all gauges and widths."

Mr. ALLISON. These are all of steel; nothing but steel is covered by the paragraph.

Mr. BECK. Very well; if the language is plain enough to confine it to this paragraph it is all I care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] as amended by the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now let the amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as amended will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. Strike out from line 724—

Mr. COCKRELL. One question. What was done with the amendment of the Senator from Iowa?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then the question is upon the amendment as amended by his amendment. Now let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment as amended.

The ACTING SECRETARY. The amendment is to strike out from line 724 to line 740 and insert in lieu thereof:

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, by whatever process made; die-blocks or blanks; billets and bars, and tapered or beveled bars; bands, hoops, strips, and sheets of all gauges and widths; plates of all thicknesses and widths; steamer, crank, and other shafts; wrist or crank pins; connecting-rods and piston-rods; pressed, sheared or stamped shapes, or blanks of sheet or plate steel, or combination of steel and iron, punched or not punched; hammer-molds or swaged steel; gun-molds, not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron-molded steel castings, all of the above classes of steel not otherwise specially provided for in this act valued at 5 cents a pound or less, 40 per cent. ad valorem; above 5 cents a pound and not above 9 cents, 2½ cents per pound; valued above 9 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLAIR (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. I would vote "yea."

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Aldrich,	Hale,	Logan,	Plumb,
Allison,	Hawley,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Anthony,	Hill,	McPherson,	Sewell,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hoar,	Miller of Cal.,	Sherman,
Conger,	Ingalls,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor,
Davis of Ill.,	Jones of Nevada,	Mitchell,	Windom.
Dawes,	Kellogg,	Morrill,	
Frye,	Lapham,	Platt,	

NAYS—28.

Beck,	Gorman,	Jonas,	Slater,
Call,	Groome,	Jones of Florida,	Vance,
Camden,	Grover,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Coke,	Hampton,	Morgan,	Vest,
Davis of W. Va.,	Harris,	Pendleton,	Voorhees,
Farley,	Jackson,	Pugh,	Walker,
George,	Johnston,	Ransom,	Williams.

ABSENT—18.

Barrow,	Cameron of Pa.,	Garland,	Saulsbury,
Bayard,	Cockrell,	Harrison,	Sanders,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Lamar,	Sawyer.
Brown,	Fair,	McDill,	
Butler,	Ferry,	Mahone,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. In order to carry out the purpose of the amend-

ment, I now move to strike out—I suppose that will be done without objection—line 573 to 581. That is the first clause in regard to steel, which is now superseded by the amendment just adopted, or perhaps it was included in the motion already made. Perhaps it was included in my original motion, but I do not know whether it is so entered on the Journal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Ohio as first moving to strike out the lines indicated by him and some additional lines, but afterward to change his amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Are the words I refer to in the bill now, or out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are in the bill; but the Chair would hold that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as he now puts it is not in order because it proposes to strike out identically the words and no other words than those that have been inserted.

Mr. SHERMAN. I supposed there would be no objection to it; otherwise I should have insisted on my first motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there unanimous consent to the striking out of the words indicated by the Senator from Ohio from line 573 to line 581, inclusive?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the lines be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph will be reported.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs, made by Bessemer, pneumatic, Thomas-Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin, open-hearth, or by any other process except the crucible process, and not exceeding in value 2 cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; exceeding 2 cents and not exceeding 5 cents per pound in value, 1 cent per pound; and all such steel exceeding in value 5 cents per pound shall pay the rates of duty prescribed in this act for crucible cast-steel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to this amendment?

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the object of striking it out?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is embodied in the amendment already adopted; the same words. It is all put in one clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to striking out the language indicated? The Chair hears none, and it is stricken out.

Mr. SHERMAN. In line 802 I move to insert "40," according to the vote of the Senate. That is against my judgment, but I wish to make it conform to the amendment already adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be reported.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 802 it is proposed to strike out "30" and insert "40;" so as to read:

Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. COCKRELL. I raise the point of order on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SHERMAN. I then move merely to strike out the clause, and I shall insert it in other words in the proper place, because that is really embodied in the amendment that has been adopted.

Mr. BECK. I beg pardon; it is no such thing. I do not know why the Senator from Ohio says that.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to know, if it has already been adopted, why the Senator wants to let it remain and increase it 10 per cent. That is significant.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a matter of course a vote of the Senate will have to be had on it just as on the other.

Mr. BECK. Will the Senator from Ohio explain why he made the remark that the change he proposes had been adopted substantially?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is one of the clauses included in the original proposition. It is not so entered. I therefore move to strike out the words "steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem." And if that is adopted I shall propose to insert the clause at the end of the steel clauses, fixing the rate at 40 per cent. ad valorem. I submit the motion to strike out and to insert the form of words I indicated at the close of the steel clauses. That motion will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is the substance of what has been put in there, and I think the point of order lies against it clearly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I will move to strike it out and then we shall fix it afterward. If a majority of the Senate are in favor of it we can insert it in another place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio to strike out lines 801 and 802, and including the words "ad valorem" in line 803, the Chair thinks is in order; but to put the motion in the form the Senator indicated, to strike out that language and then to reinsert the same language, changing the 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. ad valorem, the Chair does not think would be in order. The motion to strike out a part of the original text, with the amendment made to it by the Senate, the Chair holds to be in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Chair whether it would be in order to strike out "30 per cent. ad valorem" and insert "3 cents a pound?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think it would. Thirty per cent. ad valorem was reserved in Committee of the Whole and has been agreed to in the Senate. It was an amendment reserved.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I move to strike out the two lines.

Mr. HOAR. Is the question whether the identical thing be stricken out a question of substance or of words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would think it is a question of both substance and words.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator can say "not especially herein provided for," or any frame of words of that kind can be put in, instead of "enumerated."

Mr. FRYE. And leave out the words "in this act."

Mr. HOAR. And leave out "in this act."

Mr. SHERMAN. I will put it in that way. I do not care anything about the form. I never regard form. It is easy enough to avoid forms if a majority of the Senate want to do it. There is no trouble in a dozen ways in doing it. I will therefore substitute in place of the words proposed to be stricken out other words, so as to read:

Steel not specifically enumerated or provided for.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest "not specifically described or provided for herein."

Mr. SHERMAN. "Steel not specifically enumerated or provided for herein, 40 per cent. ad valorem."

Mr. EDMUNDS. "Herein," according to the decisions of the courts, would confine it to that clause or section.

Mr. COCKRELL. I raise the point of order on that, of course.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let it be reported at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, beginning in line 801, the following words:

Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

And to insert:

Steel not specially enumerated or provided for herein, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. SHERMAN. The word "herein" might be a word of limitation. I do not wish to do anything indirectly. I therefore will confine my motion at present to moving to strike out these two lines, and I propose afterward to conform them to the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The words proposed to be stricken out will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, beginning in line 801, the following words:

Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. COCKRELL. I raise the point of order on that. It is certainly not the rule that the Senate may omit "specially" and "in this act," which have no meaning without restriction, and then undertake to strike it out. As I understand, the amendment is to strike out "steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem," and to insert another form of words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to strike out, and not to insert anything.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the amendment was to strike out and insert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such was the suggestion, but it was modified.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then the Senator from Ohio moves simply to strike out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He moves to strike out the clause.

Mr. SHERMAN. With a view afterward to insert the clause.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Chair, I believe, has ruled on that already.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to strike out lines 801 and 802, and a part of line 803 to the words "ad valorem."

Mr. BECK. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BECK. The Senator from Ohio was pleased to say a little while ago that 40 per cent. was substantially agreed to in regard to this paragraph, if I understood him correctly in the midst of the confusion. I desired then to know the reason he had for making that assertion. We have had no vote upon this question as to articles not enumerated, indeed, on nothing pertaining to it, nothing looking in the direction of changing what the committee and the Senate had done in regard to steel not otherwise enumerated. We have been dealing with clogged ingots, blooms, and slabs made under all sorts of processes, with the crucible cast-steel paragraph and the variety of things that were sought to be changed from specific to ad valorem rates; it has been simply a question whether we preferred the ad valorem of 40 per cent. to a number of specific duties that had been imposed, to wit, five-tenths of a cent a pound in one class and 2 cents in another, and so on.

The change of classification sought by the first amendment of the Senator from Ohio in regard to crucible steel had no connection at all with "steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act." It was for that reason I asked why it was intimated by him that the Senate had already substantially agreed to 40 per cent. on this paragraph. The Senate has not even looked at it. The law under which we are now living provides for steel not specially enumerated or provided for 30 per cent. ad valorem, and all the manufacturers who had been liv-

ing under the present law from the time it was enacted in 1861, and increased in 1863 and 1867, up to the present time, at the time the present law was passed, when the tax on steel not otherwise enumerated was fixed at 30 per cent., they were paying income taxes; they were paying 5 per cent. upon their manufactures; they were bearing all the burdens of internal-revenue taxation, all of which was removed from them fifteen years ago. A tariff commission was appointed to reduce taxes, and that tariff commission reported that the abnormal war taxes ought to be greatly reduced, and that they had reduced them from 10, from 20, from 30, and from 40 per cent. ad valorem, and in many instances up to 50 per cent.

I suppose even the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] will not claim that I am seeking to destroy any factory either with kerosene oil or by avoiding to tell who did it, if the present law is sought to be retained as to all the unenumerated articles of steel, especially after the burdens have been removed of income taxes, of taxes upon manufactures, upon licenses, and all the thousand burdens that were subjected to internal taxes, as we do not ask to reduce the present bounty but seek only to allow it to remain as it is.

Now, the proposition of the Senator from Ohio is to increase the present tax 33½ per cent. above the present law, or from 30 to 40 per cent. ad valorem, and I suppose we are all to be told that instead of reducing taxes, unless we impose 33½ per cent. additional burdens upon the people for the benefit of the great iron-masters of the country we are going to close their establishments, although for twenty years they not only have been content with that rate but have agreed that they could submit to a large reduction on present rates.

It was for that reason I desired that the yeas and nays should be called, and it was for that reason that I asked the Senator from Ohio what authority he had for saying that we had substantially settled the unenumerated articles of steel at 40 per cent. by any vote we had given when we were simply seeking to get clear of specifics based upon ad valorems in two clauses relating to steel that had no connection with the unenumerated articles of steel. I do not want any misunderstanding about this matter. It is a proposition to increase the present tariff taxation 33½ per cent., and there is nothing else in it.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. McPHERSON. I understand the Senator to say that the judgment of the Senate has not been pronounced upon a certain steel schedule in which it has cast a vote in favor of 40 per cent. ad valorem. All other steel not enumerated in this act under the bill as it now stands, I believe, is 30 per cent. ad valorem. I want to ask the Senator from Kentucky if steel of the same quality—exactly the same steel—should assume a form that it would not come in under the enumeration, why that steel should come in at a less rate of duty than the steel specially enumerated? In other words, a bloom, an ingot, a billet, has a certain form and it may be of a certain quality. Suppose another article of steel not of the same form, and it need not necessarily be of the same form, but of the same quality would not come under that particular designation, does the Senator propose to let that article of steel, because it does not exactly correspond with the described article, come in at 10 per cent. less? Is that the idea?

Mr. BECK. The idea is, as I understand it, that it was better to provide for the products of these new processes, the Bessemer, Siemens-Martin, Thomas-Gilchrist, and others, up to a certain rate, 40 per cent. ad valorem, than to have a valuation of five-tenths of 1 cent a pound, or to have specifics based upon ad valorems as they rise in value, and as to the lower grades that it was better to have an ad valorem of a certain rate; but the Senator will see that in the amendment he offered it is ad valorem up to 5 cents a pound, and then specific based upon ad valorem, and above another point which has no sort of connection with steel not specially enumerated. Some of the articles that we have enumerated may, indeed do, come in now below 30 per cent. ad valorem, and the idea is upon all those articles not otherwise enumerated not to increase the present taxes, but to allow them to come in now as they always have done, at 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then the Senator's idea of a just average both of ad valorem and specific will be below 40 per cent.

Mr. BECK. It may or may not; I do not know. No man can tell under specific duties what it is. We have allowed, for example, at the end of this schedule all manufactures not specially enumerated composed of steel, iron, copper, or zinc, or anything else, 35 per cent. ad valorem. Even many of the iron manufactured articles are at 35 per cent. now, and the steel not specially enumerated under the present law is allowed to come in at 30 per cent. I propose that it shall remain there. I do not propose to increase taxes.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator from Kentucky will not fail to notice that while we have made a certain kind of steel valued at less than 5 cents a pound subject to a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem, we have made another quality of steel subject to a duty of 2½ cents a pound, and we have made another and a higher quality of steel subject to a duty of 3½ cents a pound; and if the average of those qualities specially enumerated provided for in the comprehensive amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will come in at less than 40 per cent. ad va-

lorem, then I will say there is some force to the objection of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BECK. Does not the Senator understand very well that under the provision as to 11 cents and over, one of his amendments, whenever steel is imported worth 12 or 13 cents a pound, 3 or 3½ cents a pound is less than 33 per cent.—yes, less than 30 per cent.? Everything has been enumerated that human ingenuity could possibly find out or name. All we desire is that it shall remain as it is under the existing law, that steel in any other form shall remain as it is now, and that the tax upon it shall not be increased.

Mr. McPHERSON. But you propose to pay a premium for inventive genius on the other side to devise some way to get in steel here not specially enumerated.

Mr. BECK. I propose to give the people of this country who have to sell a large portion of what they raise on their farms abroad, certainly 70 per cent. of all their cotton, 40 per cent. of all their wheat, and certainly half of their bacon, a right to buy what they need at something like a decent rate; and when it is known, as the tables show, that the value of all the labor in all the iron and steel works in this country is under 20 per cent. of the value of the product, surely 30 per cent. tax upon the man who seeks to invest the proceeds of what he has sold in something he must have, being 10 per cent. more than all the labor paid by the manufacturers, yes, 15 per cent. more, ought to be enough bounty on things that have not been found out so as to tax them specifically. There are very many things in the bill that are under 30 per cent. as well as articles enumerated. I can turn to them by the dozen, but I do not care to do that. For example:

Mill-iron and mill-cranks of wrought iron, and wrought iron for ships, steam-engines and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing each twenty-five pounds or more, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

So with many other things. All I ask is why the present duty should be increased upon those unenumerated articles when everything has been enumerated that was thought to need protection? Wherever a man could be found who had anything that he desired to have named at the highest price, he claimed all he could for it and has generally got it. I only seek to have the present rate of taxation retained as to these things.

Mr. SHERMAN. I again repeat that the Senate by the vote already taken substantially decided this question. It is not to be presumed, I say, in behalf of the Senate and its honor that the Senate will so frame a tariff bill as to invite a constant fraud and evasion of it. When the Senate decided that 40 per cent. ad valorem on steel was a fair and reasonable rate, whether for revenue or protection, they meant it to apply to all forms of steel, by whatever process made or by whatever name known. Why should not they apply to any form of steel? What reason should be given why a lower rate of duty should be put upon steel that may be christened by a new name so that it may be allowed to come in at a lower rate of duty? If you invite this evasion of the law, people who make steel in Scotland will call some new article, some new brand of manufacture, a Scotch blast instead of a bloom. They evaded the old law by calling a new form of steel a bloom instead of a billet, a bar instead of a rod, and in that way evaded the tariff law.

It follows as a matter of course, if we intend to be fair and right, that a corresponding duty should be put upon all forms of steel, and that no temptation should be held out to foreign manufacturers to evade the laws of the United States by the invention of a new name. To show that my proposition, or the proposition which I intend to make as a substitute, does not include this, I call the attention of the Senate to this matter. The Finance Committee reported on all articles of steel not enumerated a duty of 3 cents a pound. That was the provision in the bill as it was reported to us. I may say if we were at liberty to talk about it that the Senator from Kentucky agreed to it, because it was reported just as the rest of it, at 3 cents a pound.

Mr. BECK. I opposed the bill in the beginning, and avowed that unless it was materially changed I never would vote for it. The Senator from Ohio has a wonderful faculty for forgetting.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose the Senator from Kentucky is alone of all members of the Senate at liberty to change what has been proposed. I suppose that he has a monopoly, and it is a right which he has that he can propose amendments because he was opposed to everything. So he was, and I say that if the Senator could make a bill he would make a free-trade bill, judging him by the standard he has proposed.

I want to show that this does not increase the present duty. We have got under the present law an importation of \$5,744,512 worth of steel imported under this clause "steel in any form not otherwise enumerated." The duty collected on that steel was \$1,723,353, and the Finance Committee reported as part of the provisions of this bill that all unenumerated kinds of steel should be taxed at the rate of 3 cents per pound. I do not care which of these is adopted. It ought to be either 40 per cent. ad valorem, the same rate that the Senate has by a vote fixed upon other forms of steel, or it ought to be put, as it would be better to put it, at a specific rate, so that it would completely cover all forms of steel hereafter devised. We should not invite fraud; we should not seek to make evasions of the law or frame our laws so that any ingenious man, not an inventor, but a foreign manufacturer, a foreign producer, working in foreign countries, should ride through and disregard our laws. If we are to have 40 per cent. let it apply to all

steel; but I prefer, as in the amendment that I shall offer, to fall back upon the report of the committee and say 3 cents a pound, which is the exact equivalent of the present duty now levied by law.

As a matter of course these newly-invented forms are sometimes of a higher value, but still wishing to make a general specific rate apply to all, if these words are stricken out, and they plainly ought to be according to the vote just taken, I will move to substitute the clause with 3 cents a pound added, precisely as reported from the Committee on Finance, and that will make no increase of the present rate of duty and there can be no pretense of increase, because it will be exactly the rate at which these articles to the extent of \$5,000,000 worth have been imported under the present law.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be agreed to. I understood this amendment, as in substance embraced, not in words, because I knew that changes would have to be made afterward, as was stated, but in substance really acted upon.

Mr. COCKRELL. How much would this clause cover? What was the importation of the past two years covered by the clause you desire to insert?

Mr. SHERMAN. We have covered by the clause that has been adopted all forms of steel now known, but there may be new devices. The Senator himself may see that some ingenious manufacturer may call an article not a bloom.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is the point: How much was covered by this sweeping clause that you propose now to insert during the past year? How much were the importations under that?

Mr. SHERMAN. Five million seven hundred and forty-four thousand five hundred and twelve dollars' worth; but the Senator must remember that the old clause provided for steel in any form not otherwise provided for, while the pending measure provides for all the articles that are known to have come in under that clause not otherwise provided for.

Mr. COCKRELL. In the old law there were other provisions besides that? That was not the only provision that referred to steel?

Mr. SHERMAN. But they evaded those.

Mr. COCKRELL. In the old law did they not cover all the known forms of steel at the time the act was passed and put that in as a saving clause just as you are doing now?

Mr. SHERMAN. Precisely as we are doing now, but that very provision was evaded. The duties pointed out by the existing law did not happen to include steel blooms and did not include steel bars. I read a while ago the provisions of the old law.

Mr. COCKRELL. I believe it did not catch cotton-ties; did it?

Mr. SHERMAN. It was said not to include cotton-ties; but cotton-ties form a manufactured article that came in at a different rate, and we have made a specific rate.

Mr. COCKRELL. How was it with barbed wire or that clause?

Mr. SHERMAN. It did so. They evaded the law in respect to that so far as steel was concerned; but blooms were the article that was invented.

Mr. President, we ought to make the laws uniform. It seems to me it can not be made plainer unless Senators want to put a lower rate of duty on non-enumerated articles in order to invite just the evasions that were made before.

I was about to say in regard to cotton-ties that, though I may be mistaken, it seems to me if I belonged to that side of the Chamber I would not ask for a discrimination to be made in favor of an industry of my part of the country. I have not in any case desired to frame a law so as to give my State or my section an advantage, and I do not think the cotton-tie clause, although it was yielded by the Senator from Vermont, is defensible on that ground. I think it ought to be covered by the general provisions of the existing law; but I do not propose to renew that contest.

I do not believe it is right in a tariff law to frame laws expressly to favor particular sections. I say that in this bill throughout the section of country from which the Senators who vote against the bill come is uniformly discriminated in favor of, and no more than in the cotton-tie clause. It ought not to be done; it ought not to have been done. It ought to have been subject to the same general law; but that has nothing to do with this clause. That is already provided for.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator will remember that there is a little iron in Missouri as well as in Ohio. We have got enough iron in Missouri to supply the world and leave Ohio entirely out.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; and I say not only to the Senator but to the people of Missouri that if Missouri and Tennessee and Alabama would stand by the principle of protection to American industry their mountains of iron planted by God, there to be worked by man, would soon be actively used in manufactures. There are now millions of dollars of capital waiting to develop those mines.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator will allow me to ask him what would become of our cotton-fields and our other agricultural pursuits?

Mr. SHERMAN. Your cotton-fields would be doubled in value. If you would plant there in the valleys of Alabama, along the hillsides, where you have abundance of coal and lime and iron ore standing side by side often, instead of discouraging the development of that industry, you would give employment to new laborers who would go there to develop

your wealth; your cotton would be improved in value, manufactories would spring up alongside of the cotton-fields in every large town of the South, and would convert your cotton into yarn, thus doubling its value to your people. The first operation of the cotton manufacture changing the raw fiber, which is the work of agricultural labor, into the first process of manufacture, would double your cotton crop. Instead of that you are content to send the great mass of your 6,000,000 bales of cotton to a foreign land to be there converted into yarn, and then brought back here.

If the principle of protection should be sustained and maintained in behalf of the Southern States, according to the principles of Mr. Berrien and the other great men whom my friend from Vermont mentioned, you would have cotton yarn produced there, and in time you would have cotton cloth produced there, and then your cotton lands would be doubled in value. You would save all the transportation. Now your cotton has to be carried thousands of miles by rail and steamer to England, there to be woven into yarn and brought back here again for home consumption. The very cotton upon the backs of the colored laborers of the South, in order to be utilized for any useful purpose, has to be transported from Alabama to Manchester, and then back again in the form of cotton cloths to clothe the laboring men. What you want is to bring the manufactories home to your cotton-fields, plant them in your towns, build up your industries, and the lands of your Southern States would double and treble in value. So they have done in Ohio. In the manufacturing regions in my State, where formerly all the crops had to be sent abroad to New York and eastward to market, where the eggs, the butter, the wheat, the corn, and all the variety of products of that rich agricultural country were sent to New York, and the farmer got a small price, now the farmer gets double the price, because he sells to the people at home, who must consume the food he raises. The labor employed in manufacturing adds to the value of the farm and adds to the value of the products of the farm.

Sir, I do not intend to make a speech on political economy. I only desire to come back to the point and say if you put a duty of 40 per cent. on steel in the forms now known to man, you should not tempt anybody else to evade your laws by putting a lower rate of duty on the same article by a different name. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the people of the South now produce more than three times enough cotton to clothe the people of the United States. They ship two-thirds of their annual crop abroad. They have to sell their cotton in a market where they have no control of the price. They are dependent for two-thirds of it entirely upon foreign consumption.

When the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] first opened this debate during the last session of Congress he informed the people of the South that they ought to restrict their cotton production; that they were making too much; that they were overproducing, as if we had something else to which we could divert our attention and cut down our crop of cotton. The Senator from Ohio now says we ought to manufacture it at home. If we could manufacture one-third of the cotton at home, every pound of it that is spun and woven in the United States, then what would become of the balance of it? We should have to seek a foreign market for that. It would be a mere transfer of the industry of cotton spinning and weaving from Northern to Southern States. We are not in a condition now to do that. We have not got the capital, we have not got the experience. We shall never have either capital or experience in that country until we can get some relief from onerous taxation, until we can have some chance to lay up a little money to engage in that kind of business.

The Senator from Ohio lives in a country in which manufactures of iron and steel have been a long time established. A great deal of capital has gone into that business, put in individual enterprise and in corporate enterprise, but more largely the corporations have been engaged in the manufacture of iron and of steel. He insists now, and those who are protectionists in my part of the country insist, that we shall manufacture pig-iron from our cheap ores and ship it to Ohio and Pennsylvania for the purpose of having it there converted into commodities of commerce. One reason why this is insisted upon is that the North and the East have invested the larger part of their surplus earnings in railroads.

The railways of the United States to-day are more largely owned by persons interested in manufactures and in transportation and the means of getting fuel and the like than by any other class of people in the United States. They want the transportation as well as the privilege of manufacturing our raw material, and they desire to keep us down to the position where we shall be mere producers of the raw material in iron as well as everything else. That sort of subordinate condition we have enjoyed until we have nearly starved ourselves at it. We do not find ourselves either encouraged or permitted by the existing condition of affairs to abandon a very large and valuable area of the cotton-growing country where we have the monopoly given to us of that product by the laws of physical nature.

The cotton production in the South is due in part to its latitude and in part to the laws of physical geography, which I need not enter into a discussion or explanation of. Certain it is that there is a large area of country south of the James River in which cotton, and only cotton,

can be produced as a successful crop for market. We can not compete in the production of wheat, hemp, or flax with the Northwest. We can not compete in the production of corn with the great central States of this country, and we must rely upon that which nature has placed within our reach for the purpose of bettering our condition.

How are we going to get the money, the capital, the power to go extensively into iron manufacturing at our own homes unless we can do it by some accumulation of our earnings? What we complain of now is that the rabid industries of the Northern States, largely capitalized and in the hands of incorporations, demand excessive taxation out of the agricultural productions of this country, and thereby cut us off from all means of saving money enough to engage in other industries. What we desire now is that they shall not be indulged in their ravening for what little we can earn.

The people of the United States will wake up some of these days to find that not only the cotton industry of this country has been prostrated but that the grain and provision producing industries have in a like way been prostrated by the cormorant greed of these capitalist institutions in the East, which, like the daughter of the horse-leech, cry "give, give," continually, and which yield nothing to any other people in the world; and that, sir, in the name of American labor. When there are ten men engaged in agriculture to where there is one engaged in any other branch of mechanical industry or in mining, the claim is put up here that the one man against the ten is the American laborer, the impersonation of all the rights of American labor, and unless you can protect him American labor must go to destruction, forgetting entirely the remaining part of the great laboring community of this country.

There is no one single burden which is placed in this tariff, whether upon iron and steel or upon any other commodity whatsoever, that does not impinge right upon the shoulders of the producing communities of the United States. They get some recompense, I grant you, in home markets, but still the price of those home markets, as has been often shown, is not regulated at home, it is regulated abroad. We have to pay the home prices for what we consume, notwithstanding there may be a cheaper market abroad.

I shall not detain the Senate by going further into this subject, but the remarks of the Senator from Ohio seemed to require at least that some Senator from the South should show that his enterprise of converting the South into a manufacturing country, closing up all the avenues to wealth and progress that nature affords us through our agriculture, is one that is futile and utopian. There is no soundness in it. There is nobody going to be deceived by it. We understand, or at least we think we do, where the burden falls upon us and our way to work out of it; and we hold up our hands imploringly to the people of the United States who, by combination and confederacy, and through the assistance of outside congresses, are continually pooling all of their issues against us, combining together for the purpose of destroying our interests in the South. We ask you in the name of the Constitution and of the law of the country, and of justice and of equality, that you will not place too weighty a burden upon the shoulders of men who have had enough to contend with and enough to struggle against in the past.

No, sir; we shall have no prosperity in the South, that is a clear case, until there is some relief of taxation. Here you have cut down the burden of—what? You have cut down the number of dollars that you get into your Treasury, but you increase the burden of taxation very much greater than it is under existing laws. This artfully devised bill, this bundle of legerdemain and trick, this wise, intricate, involved, curious scheme is intended in all of its parts to bear upon the great agricultural communities of this country.

Senators may fancy that the people of the United States have not got the common sense to see through it, but they are greatly mistaken. There are some simple propositions, a few home-spun propositions connected with this subject which a common mind can understand, and all the art and all of the logic and all of the rhetoric and fine-spun theorizing of Senators like the Senator from Ohio can never so far blind the people of this country that they can not see through the error of his plans, and can never so far deter them or smother them that they will not rise in their majesty for the purpose of breaking it down.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Ohio gives notice that he intends to offer a proposition to make unenumerated steel articles pay a duty of 3 cents a pound, and gives as a reason for this suggestion that the Committee on Finance so reported it. I trust he will not offer that amendment but will offer an amendment to place unenumerated articles upon the same basis as articles enumerated by the amendment already offered by him and agreed to in the Senate.

When this question was up before I made a motion that unenumerated steel should be inserted at 2½ cents a pound instead of 3 cents; and, as I remember, the Senator from Delaware made some objection to that for the reason that high classes of steel would come in at a low ad valorem while steel in its ruder forms would come in at a high ad valorem. Thereupon, I think at the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware, I modified my amendment so as to allow this class of steel to come in at 30 per cent. ad valorem, and that is the present law. All unenumerated steel comes in at 30 per cent., as I understand, and we find

by turning to the tables of last year that there was a very large amount of steel so imported. That included almost entirely low grades of steel, such as blooms and other articles. Steel rods for fencing-wire come in now at 30 per cent. ad valorem. Am I not correct in that? I appeal to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think so.

Mr. ALLISON. Steel rods for fencing-wire come in at 30 per cent. ad valorem; steel blooms come in at 30 per cent. ad valorem; but now in this bill we have enumerated every known thing. As Mr. Oliver stated before the committee when he was inquired of in reference to the rate on unenumerated steel, everything known to the trade was enumerated in the bill as proposed by the Tariff Commission. This is an *omnium gatherum* clause that is intended to reach articles not specifically described; but by going over the bill for a long time and making specific rates, on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, we have now included more than two-thirds of the importations of steel at an ad valorem rate. The clause inserted this morning will, in my judgment, include two-thirds of all the imported steel that will come into this country. So, having fixed this universal ad valorem upon a great number of articles, it seems to me it would be manifestly unjust to keep the rate at 30 per cent., because then new modes and new processes will be invented for the very purpose of avoiding this rate of duty.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The 30 per cent., if the Senator will pardon me, is the present law on non-enumerated steel. The amendment agreed to by the last vote of the Senate, if I am correctly informed, diminishes the rate of duty from the present law so that the enumerated steel is brought nearer into proportion with the non-enumerated steel of the present law than it was before. If, therefore, we have reduced the rate on the enumerated steel, whether you call it ad valorem or specific, why should we increase the rate on the non-enumerated steel?

Mr. ALLISON. That is a very excellent statement of a reason for not increasing the rate on non-enumerated steel if we have reduced it upon enumerated steel. We have undoubtedly by the vote taken this morning reduced the duty on some classes of enumerated steel, but we have in my judgment increased the duty also upon some other classes of enumerated steel.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But the general result is a reduction.

Mr. ALLISON. That there are greater reductions than increases I am not prepared to say; but it seems to me if we are to make any ad valorem we ought to make one that will nearly correspond with the ad valorem already in the bill. We have prepared, as the Senator from Vermont will see, for a large number of articles in this bill that are to come in at 40 per cent. ad valorem. I can not see why, that being true, we should not allow the non-enumerated steel, if there is likely to be any such, to come in at the same rate.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio in his glowing eulogy on American labor took occasion again to intimate that I was a general obstructionist, and that upon my motion the gate of taxation in this paragraph was cut down. As nearly everything vicious in the eyes of the friend of monopoly in the bill seems to be attributed to me, I intend to keep the truth spread on the RECORD, so that it shall meet all the charges.

This motion to make this tax 30 per cent. was not made by me, nor was it advocated by me, nor did I say one word about it, though I agreed to it and approved it. The RECORD shows what took place. It seems to be necessary to keep reading the RECORD to prevent bold assertions from being assumed to be facts. On the 30th of January (page 58 of the RECORD) the following proceeding took place:

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator from New Jersey think that unless the word "quality" is inserted there will be some trouble about the higher grades of steel?

Mr. McPHERSON. In the former sections we provide for steel of a certain size and certain weight.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I submit to the Senator from New Jersey that the way to correct is to strike out "in any form" and say:

"Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem."

I think that covers everything.

Mr. McPHERSON. I think the use of that phraseology is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. ALLISON. Well, strike out "in any form" and say:

"Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem."

Mr. McPHERSON. I have no objection to striking out those words. Perhaps that would be an improvement on my motion.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest, then, the striking out of the words "in any form."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment just suggested by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I move to strike out "3 cents per pound" and insert "30 per cent. ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BAYARD. Yes; I think that is better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McPHERSON. In the whole metal schedule the commission has, I think, very wisely adopted a specific duty instead of an ad valorem duty. I should like to inquire why in this particular case there is a deviation from that well-known rule, which I believe to be a good rule?

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator address himself to me?

Mr. McPHERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. The reason is that there is a great variety of price, for steel, dependent upon the quality and grade of it. This bill provides 3 cents per pound; I suggested a reduction to 2½ cents; the Senator from Delaware suggested a further reduction to 1½ cents per pound, and made a very excellent argument show-

ing why 2½ cents per pound would be a very high rate upon a class of steel that might be imported; and so it occurred to me that the best way is to hold to the present law, which simply makes an ad valorem according to the value and quality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio did not say one word against it nor did he then think that any free-trader was seeking to close up the workshops of the country or to destroy the business of the manufacturers; nor did he take occasion then to advise us, as he has done a dozen times in the last week, of the great desire he has to protect American labor. When this proposition was made by the Senator from Iowa in his presence he acquiesced and consented to what was then done without saying a word, yet to-day he charges upon me that I had it done to destroy American industry, and he says he will seek to restore the duty to 3 cents a pound because, as he alleges, it is the equivalent of the present rate.

There is another assertion which I desire to meet, because that Senator had examined Mr. Oliver himself, the member of the commission who took charge of the metal schedule before the Committee on Finance, and we had his statement printed and laid upon our desks. The question was put to Mr. Oliver, what would be the tax upon steel at 3 cents a pound, in these words:

Senator BECK. Then 3 cents a pound would be about 60 per cent.?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, perhaps so. But suppose there was a new article which would be called a "lump." This direct process might allow that to come in under it.

Mr. Oliver went on to say they had put the duty very high so as to try to exclude these articles. Mr. Oliver agreed that it was about 60 per cent. Yet the Senator from Ohio tells the Senate he will ask to insert 3 cents again in order that it may be exactly 30 per cent., which is the present law, when the object of fixing the rate of duty at 3 cents, according to the man who drew the schedule as stated to the Senator from Ohio, was to make it so high at 3 cents a pound as to make it prohibitory, or at least so as to make it pay a rate of duty higher than any like enumerated article.

I do not propose to defend myself particularly against that class of charges. I understand why they are made; it is obviously in order to throw discredit upon what I may say in regard to the reductions I seek to make in this bill. I am only seeking by every fair means to give the people of this country a reasonable chance to buy what they need at a fair price, and at the same time to give such incidental advantages while supplying the necessary revenues of this country as will enable our manufacturers to compete with anybody anywhere engaged in like employments. I am willing in this provision to give them all they ever had, all they had when they had income taxes to pay, all they had when they had 5 per cent. to pay as a tax on manufactures when the war burdens were heavy upon them. The Senator from Ohio is not content with that. Perhaps I can tell him the reason why. I hold in my hand one of the leading protectionist papers in this country. They have three of them that I often see, perhaps they have a dozen others. I receive three regularly—The Bulletin, The Protectionist, and The Philadelphia American. I read the American regularly, because it is the best and ablest paper among them. It generally differs with me, I believe always, but it is reasonably respectful in its disagreements. This is the view it takes of these matters:

So, with reference to the tariff, every genuine protectionist and the few genuine free-traders in the House and Senate are agreed that our customs system must be based on some general principle, while the two parties are of different minds as to what that principle is. But there are a great many people in Congress who seem to be guided by no principle in the matter. They are like the old Pennsylvania Democrat in the Lehigh Valley, who was passionate for free trade in everything but pig-iron. They are ready to vote down every duty that touches a commodity not produced in their district, and ready to support the highest duties on such as are. This is true especially of gentlemen who call themselves revenue reformers, and whose willingness for reform reminds us of Artemus Ward's readiness to sacrifice all his wife's relations at the shrine of patriotism.

But we can not acquit some who generally are recognized as protectionists. Mr. SHERMAN, for instance, after failing to secure such duties as he thought should be imposed on Ohio iron, proceeded to help to pull down the duties on articles on the metal schedule not produced in Ohio, on the plea that if Ohio could not get what she wanted Pennsylvania and other States should fare no better. For a man of Mr. SHERMAN's national aspirations this was a singularly narrow policy. Indeed, we can understand it only as meaning that Senator SHERMAN has no Presidential aspirations and has accepted the defeat of 1880 as final.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. BECK. I should like to know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his question of order.

Mr. HOAR. It is a clear violation of the rules of the Senate for Senators to bring up newspaper articles here attacking or criticising Senators by name. The Senator has no right to read a document which contains matter which he could not utter in his speech.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear the rule showing it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will indicate the rule.

Mr. HOAR. It is the universal rule.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is perfectly in order. It is no reflection upon the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. INGALLS. The universal law in parliamentary bodies is that no member shall be alluded to by his name.

Mr. HOAR. That is it exactly.

Mr. INGALLS. He must always be designated by the State or district from which he comes.

Mr. BECK. I will quit reading it.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator from Tennessee who occupies the chair is aware of that, of course.

Mr. BECK. I will not read any more if anybody thinks it is a violation of the rule. I did not suspect it. That is the ablest paper published in the interest of the protectionists; and when the Senator from Ohio states that he has been for keeping up this metal schedule all through, I read his own speech in behalf of the amendment made by the Senator from Georgia, in which he used substantially the language used in that paper, that if they can not get pig-iron and any other interests protected up to the point that he desired he was not going to aid the great corporations, as he called them—and he denounced them again the other day—to get what they wanted. Now he has changed his mind. I do not know whether it was because of the threat in that paper that he thought it was best to turn now and look to Pennsylvania and the great iron-masters in order to show them that he had not abandoned them as they thought he had. It may be that he has some aspirations that he is now so zealous for putting up the rates that he was equally zealous in putting down three weeks ago.

When I am told that I am working in the interest of men who are importers and others in seeking to tear down and destroy the manufactures of this country I am stopped when I venture to assert that gentlemen are more inconsistent than I in now seeking to raise duties above the present rates when they sat silently by or had themselves advocated those amendments reducing taxes that are now in the bill, simply because telegrams came from Ohio and from Pennsylvania iron-masters ordering their friends to defeat the bill unless those increases are given. We have been told over and over again, in violation of all the rules of the Senate, by the Senator from Ohio, what the House had done, and how wise its action has been, and how foolish we were; and the Senator from Massachusetts sat by his side smiling at his attacks upon this side of the body and never ventured to call him to order, but I am to be called to order when I read a newspaper article from a leading protectionist paper of the country complaining of the inconsistency of these gentlemen.

Why did not the Senator from Massachusetts think about his questions of order when he heard the Senator from Ohio tell the Senate that our whole schedule was made up foolishly and that the wisdom of Congress was concentrated in the House bill, led by the great, I was about to say by the father of pig-iron—he prides himself in being so called—and that we had to follow and adopt the views of the House or he would defeat the bill? All that tirade was in order; all that was in perfect accord with the views of the Senator from Massachusetts as to orderly proceedings. He did not then call for the enforcement of the rules, but he calls for order loudly now when I am attacked, first by the Senator from Vermont and then by the Senator from Ohio, and attacked for doing what I did not do, either in regard to the clogged ingots which, one or both said, I had stricken down when it was done by the Senator from Georgia, who was the ally of the Senator from Ohio in all those reductions, or in regard to the 30 per cent., which was done on motion of the Senator from Iowa with his assent.

I care nothing about newspaper articles, and I make no attack on men; but when I am attacked and the truth is on my side I intend to show what the truth is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let the question be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out lines 801, 802, and 803, in the following words:

Steel not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). I would vote with a great deal of pleasure "nay" in this case if I were not paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. MCDILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR].

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SLATER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KELLOGG]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. MORGAN. I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PLUMB. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BECK and Mr. COCKRELL. He would vote "nay."

Mr. PLUMB. On the assurance of his colleague that he would vote "nay," I will vote.

Mr. BLAIR. On this question I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—26.

Aldrich,	Frye,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Allison,	Hale,	McPherson,	Sewell,
Anthony,	Hawley,	Miller of Cal.,	Sherman,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hill,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hoar,	Mitchell,	Windom.
Conger,	Jones of Nevada,	Morrill,	
Dawes,	Logan,	Platt,	

NAYS—28.

Beck,	George,	Johnston,	Ransom,
Butler,	Gorman,	Jonas,	Vance,
Call,	Grover,	Jones of Florida,	Van Wyck,
Camden,	Hampton,	Maxey,	Vest,
Coke,	Harris,	Pendleton,	Voorhees,
Davis of W. Va.,	Ingalls,	Plumb,	Walker,
Farley,	Jackson,	Pugh,	Williams.

ABSENT—22.

Barrow,	Edmunds,	Kellogg,	Saulsbury,
Bayard,	Fair,	Lamar,	Saunders,
Blair,	Ferry,	Lapham,	Sawyer,
Brown,	Garland,	McDill,	Slater.
Cockrell,	Groome,	Mahone,	
Davis of Ill.,	Harrison,	Morgan,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN WYCK. I desire a vote on the amendment I offered a few days ago.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to inquire if my amendment is not next in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of which notice has been given will be considered as they are called up or presented.

Mr. CONGER. I rose to offer an amendment just before the other was disposed of, and I wish to be recognized at some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK] is recognized, and calls up an amendment of which he has heretofore given notice. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be reported.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 918, it is proposed to strike out "\$1" and insert "50 cents;" so as to read:

Sawed boards, plank, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, whitewood, sycamore, and bass-wood, 50 cents per 1,000 feet.

Mr. VAN WYCK. Mr. President, I do not desire to say a single word in regard to the merits of this matter; neither do I desire to be understood as asking the Senate to change a vote which had been deliberately given, but the Senate will readily see that this proposition is entirely different from the proposition voted upon in Committee of the Whole. I have discovered, of course (and therefore I will not undertake to call for a repetition of the vote upon that proposition), that there is a vast deal of repugnance upon both sides of this body to having any matter positively put upon the free-list. That was a proposition voted upon in Committee of the Whole making lumber entirely free. This proposition is to meet the objection of some gentlemen who felt compelled to vote against the proposition because they were voting steadily, they said, for a tariff for revenue; therefore to put lumber upon the free-list was to take away the little revenue we were collecting from that branch of the tariff. To meet that objection I have offered the amendment in the interest of the revenue and in the interest also of the persons using this article.

Mr. HALE. I do not propose to take up any time. I believe and hope that the Senate will adhere to its vote. Certainly it can not with any fairness seek to reduce this duty, which is not more than 10 per cent. now, a smaller rate than is found upon any other of the great products of American labor.

Mr. VAN WYCK. And upon a product which needs it certainly less than any other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK].

Mr. VAN WYCK called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered. The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]. I should vote "yea" if he were here.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. VAN WYCK (when Mr. SAUNDERS's name was called). I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. SAUNDERS] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KELLOGG]. If here, my colleague would vote "yea." I desire also to state that he is detained at his room by sickness.

Mr. WALKER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. Otherwise I should vote "yea." The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW].

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON]. If I were not so paired, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Beck,	Farley,	Johnston,	Pugh,
Butler,	Hampton,	Jones of Florida,	Vance,
Call,	Harris,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Coke,	Ingalls,	Pendleton,	Vest,
Davis of Ill.,	Jackson,	Plumb,	Williams.

NAYS—30.

Aldrich,	George,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Allison,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Sewell,
Anthony,	Hale,	Miller of Cal.,	Sherman,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hawley,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor,
Conger,	Hoar,	Mitchell,	Voorhees,
Davis of W. Va.,	Jonas,	Morrill,	Windom.
Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Platt,	
Frye,	Logan,	Ransom,	

ABSENT—26.

Barrow,	Edmunds,	Hill,	Saulsbury,
Bayard,	Fair,	Kellogg,	Saunders,
Blair,	Ferry,	Lamar,	Sawyer,
Brown,	Garland,	Lapham,	Slater,
Camden,	Groome,	McDill,	Walker.
Cameron of Pa.,	Grover,	Mahone,	
Cockrell,	Harrison,	Morgan,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN WYCK. In that same connection I offer another amendment on line 920, page 42, to strike out "\$2" and insert "\$1," so as to read:

All other articles of sawed lumber \$1 per one thousand feet, board measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK].

Mr. VAN WYCK. The amendment which we have just voted on was in regard to hemlock and some other species of lumber on which according to the present law there is a duty of \$1 a thousand. This is in regard to pine lumber, rough lumber \$2 per thousand. It is a distinct proposition, and I ask for the yeas and nays. I wish very much to emphasize, if the Senate will excuse me for a moment, the desire at least of this body as to the extent to which they propose to go in the reductions of the burdens upon the American people by taxation of this kind.

I would not say a word in regard to this matter except for the unweaning desire on the part of some gentlemen who are especially representing this interest to throw certain obstacles in the way to prevent the expression of the opinion of an individual who would favor this amendment by his vote were he here. I desire to know whether there was anything in the declaration of the Tariff Commission that the war tariff should be reduced; whether there was anything in the declarations of gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber who vote steadily for the highest rates of duty; declarations heretofore made that they desired some reduction in taxation. For that purpose I have offered both this and the preceding amendment, that the great portion of the American people who purchase this article shall be relieved from this tax. I want, in the first place, to have it emphatically and distinctly understood whether it is intended by any means that the people shall be relieved of any of their burdens. If so, from what can they be more properly relieved than from the tax on this article of lumber, which is fast disappearing from this country, which requires no protection for its support, and which has been probably the most remunerative of all the industries protected in this bill or outside of it. For that reason I desire the yeas and nays.

Mr. HALE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN (when Mr. BARROW's name was called). On this question I understand my colleague [Mr. BARROW] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR]. I understand the pair runs for the day on all questions that may come up during the day.

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I am generally paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR], but I reserved the right to vote on this question. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM].

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VAN WYCK (when Mr. SAUNDERS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SAUNDERS] being confined to his room by illness, I desire to say in his behalf, because he has been misquoted in the press and is attempted to be misquoted by gentlemen on this floor who know nothing about it and who have undertaken to pair him so that he could not give expression to his opinions, which have been called in question—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that no debate is in order during a call of the roll.

Mr. VAN WYCK. I desire to say—

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. State how your colleague would vote.

Mr. VAN WYCK. I will state how he is paired; he is paired in favor of this proposition. He is for free lumber. He is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TABOR].

Mr. TABOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SAUNDERS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALKER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL], otherwise I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 18, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—18.

Beck,	Hampton,	McDill,	Vance,
Butler,	Harris,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Coke,	Ingalls,	Pendleton,	Vest.
Davis of Ill.,	Jackson,	Plumb,	
Farley,	Johnston,	Pugh,	

NAYS—30.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Platt,
Allison,	Frye,	Logan,	Ransom,
Anthony,	George,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Brown,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Sewell,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hale,	Miller of Cal.,	Voorhees,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hawley,	Miller of N. Y.,	Windom.
Conger,	Hoar,	Mitchell,	
Davis of W. Va.,	Jonas,	Morrill,	

ABSENT—23.

Barrow,	Fair,	Jones of Florida,	Saunders,
Bayard,	Ferry,	Kellogg,	Sawyer,
Blair,	Garland,	Lamar,	Sherman,
Call,	Groome,	Lapham,	Slater,
Camden,	Grover,	Mahone,	Tabor,
Cockrell,	Harrison,	Morgan,	Walker,
Edmunds,	Hill,	Saulsbury,	Williams.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I now move the amendment that I offered, and which is upon the Secretary's desk, to strike out all after line 788, on page 36, down to and including line 800 on the next page, and insert what will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. The words proposed to be inserted are:

There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence-wire, and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and tagger-tin, heretofore provided for), when galvanized or coated with any metal, alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatsoever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act. On iron wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound, in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made. On steel wire rope and wire strand, 1½ cents per pound, in addition to the rates imposed on the wire from which it is made.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It will be observed that I strike out several propositions in the bill and insert others in lieu thereof. The first proposition that I seek to amend is:

That wire rope and wire strand, of iron or steel wire, shall pay the same rates of duty that are levied on the wire of which they are made and one-fourth of 1 cent per pound additional.

The reason for it is that there has been no adequate provision made in this bill for that increased stage of manufacture of wire rope. The rope, for instance, that enters into the construction of the Brooklyn bridge has cost at least 1 cent a pound to manufacture it from the wire strand, and it is proposed in the Senate bill to allow for that stage of manufacture only one-quarter of 1 cent per pound.

I make a separate provision which applies to the wire. I hold in my hand two samples of wire in which the wire is as fine as silk, finer than a hair; it is woven into cables, and unless provision is made for it in this bill it will be possible to import that steel-wire cable or strand at exactly the same rate as the wire itself from which it is made. I submit that there ought to be some provision made for this additional stage of manufacture. My own State is somewhat interested in this, of course. There are, I think, ten manufactories in the United States. There are two in New Jersey, one in New York, one in California, and six in Missouri, with a capital invested of something like \$4,000,000. Iron rope is made of the best charcoal-iron, and steel rope is made of the best charcoal-steel.

As the bill is now arranged the duty is scarcely anything; there is no protection whatever, and this steel and iron rope could come in at just as cheap a rate as the wire from which it is made. I only ask for a reasonable amount of increase in order that the industry may be preserved.

The other thing that I call attention to is the fact that after line 792, which refers to the galvanizing process of iron wire, you will observe in looking at the bill that the phraseology is very much confused, ungrammatical, and not very readily understood. I had proposed an increase above the rate proposed in this bill. Only one-fourth of 1 cent a pound is the rate provided, while I propose a half cent a pound for all wire except fence-wire. I except from the operation of this, fence-wire.

Mr. DAWES. I should like to inquire if it does not cost just as much to galvanize fence-wire as it does any other wire?

Mr. McPHERSON. Yes; but I am making allowance for the granger sentiment.

Mr. DAWES. Local prejudice! Has the Senator any other reason for excepting fence-wire than that?

Mr. McPHERSON. I have heard so much about the poor farmers in the past three weeks that I made up my mind that I would propose something to meet the views of the farmers.

Mr. DAWES. Does the Senator say there is no reason for giving an additional duty upon the other wires that does not exist as to fence-wire?

Mr. McPHERSON. I was in hopes the Senator would not press me quite so closely; but inasmuch as he has, I must say that I do not see any reason.

Mr. LOGAN. Does it apply to any other kind of wire except galvanized wire?

Mr. McPHERSON. It applies to all wire used for the purpose of manufacturing wire cables, but as to the galvanizing process, that is distinctly provided for by itself in my amendment. In the process of galvanizing 45 per cent. of the zinc used is wasted. It costs from 2 to 3 cents a pound to galvanize it, according to the amount of zinc used. This bill is based, from beginning to end, upon the idea that as we proceed and progress from one stage of manufacture to another the rate should be increased. I am sure the Senate will not refuse to allow a just and fair protection to this industry, the manufacture of wire cables, either of iron or steel, and I draw the distinction between the iron and steel cable by placing the duty upon one at 1 cent a pound and upon the other at 1½ cents.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from New Jersey intended in his exception to be very seductive and captivating to what he was pleased to call a local prejudice or the granger element, but I beg to assure him that so far as I may be considered as representing in any sense a community which entertains those sentiments, they will not be duped by the exception that the Senator offers, because there is no importation of fence-wire as such, and therefore the clause in parentheses is entirely without meaning and insensible. I beg the Senator, if he has any idea of captivating anybody by that exception, to omit it, because I assure him that no one would know better than an intelligent farmer of the West, belonging to what he calls the granger element, that that could not have any possible effect upon the price of wire. They know enough to understand that wire is not imported as fence-wire, but that it comes in by certain gauges and that it is taxed according to the gauge, and therefore the exception he proposes, the parenthetical part of his amendment, would not have any weight at all so far as their interests are concerned.

Mr. McPHERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas that I did not use that word in any offensive sense. Being a granger myself, and having no special occupation other than that of farmer, I am very much in accord with almost anything the farmers or grangers ask for, and certainly my votes upon the tariff bill have all been in favor and support of that interest. But the Senator from Kansas will see that in the application or use of the words in parenthesis I excepted fence-wire; but I confess I have some apprehension lest all wire should come in as fence-wire. When I except the fence-wire it has an effect disadvantageous to the interest I am representing now, because by employing the words at all, I suppose if a large quantity of telegraph wire were to be imported into this country it would be imported as fence-wire and used as telegraph-wire.

Mr. INGALLS. I suppose the Senator understands that wire is not imported either as telegraph-wire or as fence-wire or as strands for wire rope; it is imported as wire of a certain gauge by number, and the party importing it can use it for what he pleases. Therefore, the distinction which he inserts is entirely without significance.

Mr. McPHERSON. But it is a distinction which is found in other parts of the tariff bill. For instance you will find in the tobacco schedule a provision for tobacco suitable for wrappers. I suppose tobacco suitable for wrappers would be tobacco used for wrappers, and under some regulation of the Treasury Department it would be provided for and protected. I find in another schedule in the bill provision for different articles imported for certain specified purposes; for instance we had it the other day, a provision as to the admission of yarns used for carpets, which we very wisely struck out.

As I said before, I have no doubt this wire will come in for all purposes under the guise of fence-wire; yet if there is any regulation of the Treasury Department which can cover the case justly and equitably, or if any arrangement or rule can be adopted which will make that discrimination, I am perfectly willing to leave it in that way so that the discrimination may be made.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator will notice on line 794 the words "except fence-wire" are included in the bill.

Mr. McPHERSON. I know it; but I have changed the phraseology so as to read:

There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence-wire, and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and tagger-tin hereinbefore provided for), when galvanized or coated with any metal, alloy, or mixture of metals, by any

process whatsoever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act.

Mr. LOGAN. Looking over the bill it strikes me that the words "except fence-wire" will let in almost any kind of wire coming in without additional duty.

Mr. McPHERSON. I admit that.

Mr. LOGAN. Then the words ought not to be there.

Mr. McPHERSON. That will be the result unless there be some rule in the Treasury Department, which I presume they can make.

Mr. LOGAN. I merely suggest to the Senator that in amending the bill it would be very well to make the rule here in Congress, and not leave it to be made in the Treasury Department. This is the best place to make the law. I did not object to that exception when it was put in, but I suggested to the Senator who moved the amendment at the time that that would open the door to all character of wire to come in as fence-wire without paying the additional duty.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not believe that the farmers of this country or the people of any State in this country are unjust, and my experience and observation have taught me that all these attempts to pander to special local interests in opposition to a general principle of justice on the belief that local prejudices are likely to be opposed to legislation or to legislators when they do what is just and right are mistakes.

Here is this industry, the manufacture of wire, which in almost every form in which it has been used has been one of the greatest public benefits of this century. The manufacture of fence-wire (which it has been said more than once in this debate has made it possible to use for herding, for pasturing, for all sorts of agricultural uses which require the inclosing of land, vast spaces of this continent, the cost of fencing which with lumber wooden fences made them practically worthless for agriculture) has been, as I said, one of the great benefits of the century.

I will repeat what I said the other day, that the discovery of this barbed-wire fence has so far been such a benefit to the agriculture of this country that the farmers save from forty to forty-five millions a year in the single matter of repairs of fences, and the persons who manufacture this wire and own the numerous patents for this invention have divided on an average for the last ten years less than 8 per cent. annually. That being true, you have compelled them in this very bill to purchase the zinc in this country for the galvanizing process, which costs a cent a pound, and which alone enables this wire to resist the weather. They buy that zinc in two States. They buy 10,000 tons of it a year, with a protection of a cent and a half a pound, as I think we have left it. They buy it largely in Southern Virginia. One concern in my neighborhood buys a thousand tons of it in Southwestern Virginia, and buys a large amount in the State of Missouri, so well represented by my honorable friends on the other side of the Chamber. Those gentlemen hold on with absolute tenacity to the duty on zinc, and then they say that for this invention which is an American invention, and for this benefit which is an American benefit to the farmers of the Northwest, they will compel these manufacturers to go out of business and to give all the advantage of their invention and all the benefit of their manufacture to foreigners by putting upon zinc which they use a high duty, and then refusing to them any duty whatever. They have asked for but one-sixth part of the duty you put on the zinc; but Virginia and Missouri object, and now my friend from New Jersey finds himself compelled, against what he avows as his own sense of justice, to come in here and make this exception because he thinks there is a granger element which is unjust and dishonest, and which is not disposed to deal fairly.

Now, you have a right to be a free-trader of course. Many able, intelligent, and thoughtful men believe in the doctrine of untrammelled and unrestricted trade between countries. You have a right to be a revenue reformer of course. Many honorable men in this Chamber and outside of it believe that our existing revenue laws are full of inconsistencies and injustices. But no man can defend a bill in which he says to the manufacturers of this wire fence, "You shall pay, you American, a cent and a half duty for every pound you manufacture, but the Englishman shall bring that in without any cost to him at all, free." It is unpatriotic, unjust, unfair; and I will undertake to go to any audience or any assembly of American farmers in any State of this Union and rest my political future on a vote to do justice. I do not believe the men adequately and honestly represent any American community who cast their vote by the authority they conferred to do such injustice as that. I do not propose for one to submit to this without at least raising my voice and giving my vote in protest.

Now I move to strike out from the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey the exception he has incorporated in it.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will not prevail. I do not concur with him in the view expressed in reference to taxing wire fence. The class of people, the producers, who use this product are people who are taxed in everything they eat, drink, and wear, in every tool and implement they work with, in everything they touch. They are a class who have received no favors from any source, but who bear upon their broad shoulders all the burdens of this Government.

Sir, why did not the honorable Senator from Massachusetts advert to

the exports of this country when speaking of the farmers, and state that 83 per cent. of the exports which preserve the balance of trade to our people with the world are made by the very class upon whom he desires to heap additional taxation, while the people for whose benefit this omnibus bill has been constructed, taxing everything in the world that can be described and everything else that can be imagined even, that they furnish only 16 or 17 per cent.

It is this class who raise the wheat, the corn, the pork, the beef which feeds this country and furnishes a large amount for export to Europe; who raise the cotton and wool and sugar; who raise all the agricultural products, without which the system of taxation that is being devised in this bill would simply be impossible, because there would be nothing for it to operate upon; yet when this raw material, this fencing wire, necessary in the Northwest and Southwest where there is no fencing timber, to reduce to cultivation the land to raise more corn, more wheat, more beef, more wool, more everything for export, in order to enable the country the better to stand the enormous taxation placed upon it by this bill, the Senator from Massachusetts moves an addition to the already heavy tax on this article and an additional burden to the mountain load already resting on the class who are compelled to use it.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator if he will join in putting zinc on the free-list?

Mr. COKE. I decline to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. I did not interrupt him. He can speak when I am through.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senator—

Mr. COKE. I will give way for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. HOAR. I did not make any such proposition. I desired to ask the honorable Senator if he would join in putting on the free-list the zinc which is to be used for this purpose?

Mr. COKE. I voted against the tax now on zinc; and I will ask the Senator if he voted for the tax in this bill on zinc? The Senator declines to answer.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Texas is mistaken about that. The only motion on zinc has been on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to increase it.

Mr. COKE. I voted against increasing it.

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts how he voted?

Mr. HOAR. There has never been any vote on it that I know of.

Mr. COKE. There was a vote on a proposition to increase the duty. I voted against it.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that proposition was withdrawn. My recollection now is that there was a proposition made which the Senator from Missouri supported, and on being welcomed rather affectionately by the Senator from Michigan to the ranks of the protectionists, he said that rather than join that army he would forsake zinc.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Massachusetts is mistaken. The question came in in this way, as the RECORD will show: The Senator from Delaware moved to decrease the duty, and upon that we had some discussion. Then the Senator from Illinois moved to increase the duty on zinc, and on that the yeas and nays were called, and that was defeated. That is the whole of it.

Mr. HOAR. I do not remember about it exactly.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, I have voted all the time for reductions; I have voted to put raw materials on the free-list whenever it was possible to do it. I have turned neither to the right nor to the left. I have not regarded the interests of my own State or of my own section further than the general interests of the whole embrace them. I do not believe in the constitutional power of Congress to protect anything or anybody. I believe Congress has the right to discriminate within the revenue standard; but I believe it to be unwise and inexpedient to do so. I do not believe that you can enter upon a system of discrimination without having as a result the robbery of the whole people, such as the pending bill, if enacted, will consummate. This is the inevitable outcome of the so-called protective policy.

It is for this reason that I have tried to vote strictly for revenue and against protection for any interest or any industry or any pursuit. I have endeavored to favor that class who are more taxed than any other and who receive less benefit than any other from the tariff—the great agricultural producing class of this country. It is that class which the honorable Senator from Massachusetts would place an additional tax upon by taking away the exception from the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey relating to fencing wire.

I hope that the Senator's amendment will not be adopted. I hope that fencing wire will not have an additional duty placed upon it. I hope that the Senate will allow the great prairie plains of the West and Southwest to be developed to add infinitely to the wealth of this country with their annual productions, without burdening further a class of people whose burdens are already as great as they can bear. After the railroads get through with taxing their products and they pay the tariff tax they have barely a subsistence left, and I am opposed to putting an additional burden upon them.

We admit raw material free of duty for the manufacturers. Fencing wire is the farmer's raw material; it is already taxed between 30 and 40 per cent. in this bill, and this does not satisfy the Senator from Massachusetts. He moves to increase the duty heavily, and what is his

reason? He says in order to protect American labor. In his judgment the 75 per cent. of our people who furnish all our exports, except an insignificant per cent., do not represent American labor. I am compelled to conclude that such is his opinion. The country will not concur with him.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, what is the reason that the Senator from New Jersey proposes this amendment? He says that the duty upon ungalvanized iron being the same that is placed upon galvanized iron will result in this condition and this result, that iron will come in galvanized rather than ungalvanized, and that the work of galvanizing the iron and applying to it the material which galvanizes it will be done abroad, and that those industries in the United States now devoted to that work will necessarily cease. That is a condition of things which he deprecates. Is it a condition of things to be deprecated? Is it worth while to have a condition of things that will induce our people to do that work, or had we better depend upon the manufacture of galvanized iron abroad? That is a fair question. The Senator has answered it for himself in this particular.

The Senator from Ohio a few minutes ago pressed upon us the necessity of answering that question in reference to steel. Where steel was advanced by increased labor and capital, it was the opinion of the Senator from Ohio that an increased duty should be placed upon it. The whole iron schedule is based upon the same principle. Where you start from pig-iron through every other advance in the manufacture of iron and of steel you add to the duty. Why? Because otherwise the iron and the steel would come in in the advanced condition if it cost no more to bring it in in that condition than in the original pig. That is the principle that runs through the whole bill; that is the principle which governs the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. It is a sound principle; it ought to be maintained; no tariff bill can stand without recognizing it; and whenever a departure is made from it, it is a premium to foreign labor as against American labor and foreign capital as against American capital. He who advocates any such principle as that advocated by the Senator from Texas stands up and says he will offer a reward to the labor of Europe against the labor of this country, and he will offer a premium upon foreign capital as against American capital.

The Senator from New Jersey has pressed this with an argument which is unanswerable, and yet in his very amendment he proposes to except a certain article from the application of the principle which underlies his own amendment, and which runs through the entire tariff bill.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator will bear with me a moment. My amendment was in deference to the already expressed will and wish of the Senate in that particular.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator does himself great injustice in that admission. The Senator says there is no reason for it. The Senator has, in answer to my interrogatory, said that the very exception that he makes is a pandering—that was his word—to the granger prejudice, as he called it. The Senator, in order to carry so much of this principle as shall apply to industries within his own circle of acquaintance and influence, is willing to sacrifice principle and candor to prejudice, to violate the very principle upon which the bill itself rests; and he does this, he says, to pander to what he calls a granger prejudice.

Let us look at what that is. I know the Senator does not want to do this; I know the Senator feels that it is an ungracious thing for him to do; but the Senator would rather have the principle itself violated if he can save the application of it to certain industries. I for one will govern my vote here, as far as I have light upon this tariff bill, upon the principles upon which I believe it is founded.

I want to look at this granger prejudice as presented by the Senator a moment ago. He says he wants this barbed wire excepted because he wants the farmers upon the prairies to take the benefit of the advantage gained thereby in the fencing of their farms. He wants therefore for what he claims this benefit, the labor of Europe, to have this much advantage over the labor of America; he wants the capital of Europe to have employment as against the capital of the United States, and he wants it because he says the farmers upon the prairies can obtain their fences cheaper thereby. Let us look at that statement.

When it comes to be known in Europe that the barbed-wire fence can be imported at precisely the same rate that wire ungalvanized can, and that every galvanizing establishment in this country is thereby closed, the Senator from Texas thinks that then the manufacturers of galvanized wire abroad will keep their fence-wire down to the price where it is now. The Senator thinks that the moment he has established the monopoly abroad and the industry at home is at an end he secures to the farmers of the prairies cheap fence-wire. There never was a greater delusion that blinded man. If the Senator was deliberately determined to make the price of wire fence as high as possible, no device could be resorted to more certain to produce that result. Give the manufacture of galvanized wire solely to the foreign producer, hold out to him the promise and the assurance that he has the market in America, and the Senator from Texas will find that it costs him as much to inclose his farm as it did before barbed-wire fence was invented. The Senator from Texas forgets all along how it is that he comes to be able to fence his prairies for a dollar where it cost three before. He fails to consider that to this American industry he is indebted for the

benefit, the beneficence conferred upon every farmer in the broad West and Southwest and throughout this whole country the boon of saving for every rod of his fence a dollar on a rod; and he is unwilling that the man who saved it to him shall have 5 cents out of the dollar. That is the position the Senator takes. And so influenced by his zeal and conviction and bias and prejudice—so called by the Senator from New Jersey—is he in this effort to see to it that those who conferred that favor on the farmers of the West shall not have 5 cents in that dollar in their favor, that he is willing to adopt and fasten upon this country a policy that is sure to compel him to pay to the foreign producer that dollar when the reward and the benefit is on that side; to the laborer on that side who works for 50 cents when the laborer on this side has a dollar, and the capital on that side will supply this market and set its own price.

I do not desire any policy that will work the slightest harm to the farmer who has this blessing now. I desire to see his fence kept as cheap as it is now. I do not believe that any policy is so sure to carry out that result as the policy that will be sure to keep the manufacture in this country.

The Senator from Texas talks about the burdens that are put on the shoulders of the farmers in this country and how little benefit they have. Was he not told here the other night by the tables from the Treasury Department that 33 per cent. of all the revenues of the country were collected off the products of the soil when they come in here in competition with our own products of the soil; 33 per cent. of it all is gathered from products of the soil brought in here in competition with the products of the soil at home?

Sir, the nation has not been unmindful of the interests of the farmer. It should not be. He should be recognized everywhere; he is the most important of all the important elements making up the producers of this country, and I am thankful to know that the figures demonstrate the justice to him of the tariff policy of this Government. But, sir, woe betide the day when he shall be at the mercy of the foreign producer, whether it be the gatherer of the soil abroad or the mechanical industries abroad. Let him be independent here; let him depend upon his own neighbors and his own fellow-citizens here for what he wants, and he will be most sure thereby to get not only the best quality but at the fairest prices.

Mr. COKE. Just one word in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES]. The farmers of this country are already at the mercy of the foreign producers and foreign consumers for all they make to sell, and they are at the mercy of home manufacturers for all they must buy. If you place a man in the power of another who buys from him, and then in the power of somebody else from whom he must buy, I can not imagine a worse position for him to be in. The farmer's surplus is priced in foreign markets in competition with all the pauper labor of the world; yet the Senator from Massachusetts would have him penned up, a Chinese wall built around him, so that he can not spend the little allowed him in foreign countries for his surplus, where he could get low-priced goods, but must dispose of it here, and he would by legislation enable monopolists at home to fleece him at will, by shutting out all competition. That is the Senator's position.

Sir, this very fencing wire that the honorable Senator desires to see raised still higher in price is already protected by a duty of at least 30 per cent. in favor of his constituents who manufacture it. Is not that enough, without making it greater? Sir, the labor in that manufacture does not equal 20 per cent.; 30 per cent. duty pays back to the manufacturer every dollar that he expends for the labor in the wire; yet the Senator says that because I do not want it taxed any higher therefore I desire to turn the trade of this country over to foreigners.

I am in favor of protecting the American laborer in a proper way. We have got a tariff that piles up taxation upon every article he has to buy. Everybody knows that ninety-nine out of one hundred laborers consume all their wages in purchasing the necessities of life, and pay one-half more in this country for the necessities of life than is paid outside of this country, and they pay that much more on account of the tariff tax; yet this very tariff that sweeps away their earnings is said to be enacted solely for their benefit and in their interest. Sir, there never was a greater fraud perpetrated in the name of an industrious and honest and a deserving class than is being perpetrated in the name of the laboring people of America in this tariff. It does not protect laborers. No, sir; it eats up their substance; it takes away, absorbs, their wages, and when the difference in the purchasing power of wages in America and Europe is liquidated the balance is absolutely in favor of European wages; necessarily so, because our tariff puts everything on stilts, puts everything away up, and the laboring man has to spend every dollar he earns.

Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts that I desire to turn over the commerce of this country to European labor and European capital is untrue in any particular or in any respect. This product of barbed wire is already protected by a greater amount of duty than all the labor that enters into its manufacture. If his constituents can not sustain themselves on it they ought to fail.

It is certain that consumers should not be taxed more highly for this necessary article. If American labor is the object of the Senator's solicitude I submit that the per cent. already imposed on this article is

more than the tribute which should be exacted from four-fifths for the benefit of one-fifth. When it is considered that instead of being for the benefit of one-fifth this duty is really in the interest of a few men who own the capital invested in the manufacture of this article, the argument is still stronger.

This wire is the farmer's raw material and is a great factor in the development of the West and Southwestern country. It is indispensable and should be as little burdened as the manufacturer's raw material, which in many instances in this bill has been admitted free of duty. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. I want simply to put on record, without prolonging the debate, an absolute denial of the assertion which the Senator from Texas has made, that the protection on this product is greater than the entire sum paid for the labor.

Mr. SAULSBURY. When this question was before us in Committee of the Whole I made the motion to except wire from the provisions imposing an additional duty upon the metal when galvanized. The committee, I understood, adopted my amendment. I find, however, that now the word "fence" is interpolated, but how it came so I do not know. I was not here when the question was before the Senate, after it passed out of committee, and I suppose the word "fence" was inserted before "wire" in the Senate.

I differ entirely from the Senator from New Jersey in saying that this is a mere deference to a granger sentiment. In my remarks in Committee of the Whole I placed it distinctly upon the ground that the protection given to the manufacture of wire was ample to protect it in every shape, whether galvanized or not. You will find that wire rods are taxed six-tenths of 1 cent a pound—the rods out of which the wire is drawn. The process of drawing the wire out of the rods can be done very rapidly by those engaged in it. Then when you come to protect wire—the wire of the size used for fencing purposes—the duty is placed at 2 cents per pound. So there is 1.4 cents protection over and above what is paid on the iron rod, and that I hold is ample protection to the manufacture of wire, whether it be galvanized or not galvanized. We made an effort to get it down to 1½ cents, but it was unsuccessful. That proposition was defeated.

Now, the process of galvanizing wire, I understand, is a very simple process. I am told that the wire is simply adjusted to a crank or a reel and drawn rapidly through a bath of galvanized matter, the cheapest material of galvanizing, and that fifteen or twenty rods at a time may be drawn through this bath and passed onto the reel, so that the process is an inexpensive one as compared to the galvanizing of other metals.

This is a matter of very great importance to the farming interests of the country. The timber of the country is fast disappearing, and resort must be had to wire or other materials to inclose land and keep up the fencing necessary to protect the crops. The additional half a cent a pound proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to be placed upon this will cost the farmers a very large amount of money.

One of the Senators from Massachusetts said the process of galvanizing iron and making barbed-wire fence had saved annually to the farmers \$40,000,000. That seems like a very extravagant estimate to me, but it may be true. If there is that amount of fencing wire used half a cent a pound additional placed upon it will cost the farmers of this country a vast amount.

In reference to the competition with galvanized wrought-iron for fencing wire, the Senators from Massachusetts need have no apprehension, because barbed wire is patented in this country and can not be manufactured abroad. There is an American patent for barbed wire, and no foreign barbed wire can come in competition with it; but if this additional half cent is placed upon wire fencing, the Senators from Massachusetts will find that they have defeated the object they have in view. The farmers are not going to be made tributary to the manufacturers of barbed wire in New England or anywhere else; other wire will enter into competition, and I have seen long fences not galvanized, and I apprehend that the farmers if compelled to be tributary to the manufacturers of galvanized barbed wire will find it to their interest to defeat that attempt to make them tributary by adopting wire that is not galvanized, though it may not last quite so long.

The apprehension that our barbed iron wire would be brought into competition with European wire is a mistake, because, as I understand, this barbed iron wire is an American invention and there is an American patent upon it. I may be mistaken about that point, but that is my information, and if so there can be no foreign competition with it. The duty of 2 cents a pound provided for by the bill is ample protection for all that interest, whether the wire is galvanized or not galvanized.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will fail and that the proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be denied.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, addressed the Senate. [See Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

Mr. BAYARD. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from

New Jersey will be first read, and then the amendment to the amendment.

The ACTING SECRETARY. The amendment is, on page 36, to strike out from line 788 to the end of line 800 and insert in lieu thereof:

There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire, except fence-wire and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and tagger-tin, hereinbefore provided for, when galvanized or coated with any metal, alloy, or mixture of metal, by any process whatever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; on iron wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made; on steel wire rope and wire strand, 1½ cents per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire from which it is made.

The amendment to the amendment is to strike out "except fence-wire and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and tagger-tin hereinbefore provided for."

Mr. HOAR. Who moved that last exception? I merely moved to strike out the words "except fence-wire."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That was all the Senator from Massachusetts moved.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Texas said that the protection upon the wire was more than the price paid for the labor. I wish to say that the honorable Senator is entirely mistaken in that belief. He has been misled in some way, because a ton of this wire has put into it about \$70 additional value by labor alone, as against an added protection of about twelve dollars and a half.

I wish to say further that I should like to hear from some man who professes any sense of justice who resists this amendment. This wire, as I am credibly informed, can be taken from the manufacturer in America, carried across the Atlantic, and brought back at a less cost than the duty which we have put in this very bill on the zinc which is used in the process of galvanizing it. Now, how is it possible that any Senator can vote for this exception? It is not a question of the amount of duty on wire or on the advanced products of iron or steel, but it is a question of putting a duty upon the material for a particular process and refusing a proportionate fractional duty to the manufacturer who performs that process. That is all.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, I have to say in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts that the census figures show that the wages paid in the iron and steel manufacturing in the United States do not equal 20 per cent. of the value of the manufactured products. It was upon those figures that I made the estimate that 30 per cent., which is the amount of protection on galvanized wire, would pay back and more than pay back to the manufacturers the money expended for labor in its manufacture.

Mr. HOAR. But how in the world can the Senator from Texas derive from those figures which he states the conclusion which he drew, or anything like it, supposing them to be true. I have not investigated them to see whether they are as correct as his citation of Mr. Evarts the other day.

Mr. COKE. That was correct.

Mr. HOAR. The citation of Mr. Evarts which the Senator made was shown to be incorrect in every particular by producing the original the other day. But suppose it were true that the average wages in the iron establishments in this country bore a certain proportion to the value of the product, what has that to do with the question whether the duty on steel wire is or is not greater than the whole amount paid for the labor? There is no connection between the propositions. There is no possibility of inferring one from the other.

Mr. COKE. Does not steel wire belong to the manufactures of iron and steel?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator might as well say because the average value of all the horses in this country was \$100 therefore the value of the race-horse Dexter was only \$100. It would be as reasonable a deduction. One single establishment in my own city has a pay-roll of \$1,500,000 annually in the manufacture of wire.

Mr. COKE. The Senator from Massachusetts speaks of an erroneous quotation made by me from Mr. Evarts. I desire to say that I take square issue with the Senator, and assert that I quoted Mr. Evarts's exact language. I assert further that the letter itself, taken from the first word to the concluding word, may be read throughout and that there was not a word or a sentiment in any line or part of it that was not in consonance with the part I read.

Mr. HOAR. So the man who left all the notes out of the commandments quoted the exact language that remained, but he totally changed the meaning of the commandments. The Senator from Texas the other day quoted a single sentence of Mr. Evarts from which he claimed that the necessities of life abroad were less than in this country. After the Senator had got through with it I took that letter up nation by nation, Great Britain, Ireland, Scotland, and the continent, and showed that what he affirmed was directly the contrary in regard to each one of them, taking the sentences before where the Senator began and the sentences which followed where he left off.

Mr. COKE. The quotation made by me from the letter of Mr. Evarts was one of his conclusions derived from the testimony of all the consuls residing in foreign countries accredited from the United States. His conclusions were numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on, each an independent and integral proposition. It was the conclusion No. 9 in which Mr.

Evarts stated that American laborers perform from one and a half to twice as much labor as the foreign operatives, and I argued from that conclusion and from other facts with reference to the cost of living and wages and other results.

Mr. HOAR. That was because the foreign laborer was getting employed his whole time; that was all.

Mr. COKE. I am speaking of the accuracy of my quotation from Mr. Evarts, which has been impugned by the Senator from Massachusetts. I read it as Mr. Evarts wrote it, and my argument upon it was not answered by the Senator from Massachusetts. He can not escape its conclusions, and his effort to show that Mr. Evarts was not correctly represented in my quotations can not aid him, for Mr. Evarts's letter is of record here and so are my quotations, and I aver that he was exactly, in letter and in spirit, correctly represented, and if I am wrong nothing is easier than to show it. I again assert, on the authority of the official figures of the census, that the duty now on fencing-wire, which the Senator from Massachusetts seeks to increase, is more than enough to pay back to the manufacturer every dollar he pays for labor in its manufacture. If I am not right, then official figures are wrong; that is all.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts first addressed the Senate upon this subject he was good enough to assure the country that the American farmer was neither dishonest nor unjust. That is a concession for which I have no doubt when he learns it he will be duly grateful. The Senator was good enough also still further to admit that the American farmer was intelligent and could neither be duped nor imposed upon by attempts to pander to what he was pleased to call his prejudices. I agree with him also in that, but I beg to assure the Senator from Massachusetts that while the American farmer is both intelligent and patriotic he has a very decided purpose in view with regard to the future politics of this country. He does not desire that the fires shall be extinguished in any furnace; he would not stop the hum of the spindle nor the clamor of the forge, but I can assure the Senator that the American is determined to have an equalization of the burdens of government and society.

Take this article that we are considering. The Senator says that great benefits have been conferred upon agricultural communities by the invention of fence-wires. That is very true, and if the question of the protection that should be given to the labor in its manufacture were all that is involved, it is very probable that he would not protect. But in the first place, you impose a duty of \$6.50 per ton upon the pig-iron from which the steel is made. I assert, as I have heretofore asserted, and as I now reiterate, that there is not one ton of ore, there is not one pound of pig-iron imported into this country that is in any just sense a competitive product to any American ore east of the Alleghany Mountains. It is absolutely necessary to mix with the low-grade ores of this country for the purpose of manufacturing steel. One of the largest manufacturers of steel in Pennsylvania told me this morning that his plant for the manufacture of that product was worth more than \$1,000,000, and that every cent that he was compelled to pay for the pig-iron that he imported was a direct tax upon his raw material that he was obliged to charge over to the consumers of his product.

This is the first step in this industry. Then after the wire is drawn and barbed the farmer is compelled to pay a royalty to the patentees, amounting to three-quarters of a cent or \$16.80 for every ton that is manufactured. I am not insensible to the value of American invention; but to say that it is just that one firm in the Senator's own town, to which he has alluded, should be compelled to pay an annual royalty of \$130,000 for the use of what is known as the patent on fence-wire is preposterous. The barbs upon fence-wire as a matter of fact are no more than slivers upon a pine fence. Barbed fence-wire one of the great inventions of American industry! Mr. President, barbed fence-wire is one of the simplest of all possible applications of matter for the purpose of producing any given result. It is not a fence; it is an admonition, it is an appeal to the reasoning nature and reflective faculties of the animal by which he is advised that pain will follow in case he impinges the substance, but to say that this is an application of genius to raw material that authorizes, entitles, or justifies the continuance of such an extravagant impost as that upon the great agricultural and pastoral and grazing regions of this country for an indefinite period of time is simply absurd.

Mr. HOAR. That is not the statement, if my friend from Kansas will permit me. It is not the simple invention of the barb on the fence; it is the invention of the mechanism, of which there are some six hundred different inventions in number, which makes that product so cheap in comparison with its former cost when it was hammered out or drawn out by hand, that a rod of this fence-wire of three separate wires can be made, posts and all, for 45 or 50 cents. That is the value of the invention.

Mr. INGALLS. The inventive genius of New England has been lying in wait for the human race for the last two hundred years, and has been levying tribute upon every nation and people and country on the face of the earth. I have no doubt that that ingenuity can find abundant excuse and copious reason for every additional exaction that it is proposed to levy hereafter.

When the Senator says that this is a patent, is valuable in consequence of the invention of machinery, how does he change it? Here are two

parallel strands of wire, the simplest of all forms of matter, drawn out side by side and twisted as they proceed for the purpose of enveloping a barb that stands out upon either side for the purpose of admonishing cattle not to approach the barrier. The Senator says that that is one of the most stupendous inventions of human ingenuity. Not long since he declared that the man who invented it was superior to the great conquerors of England, and drew a picture of the honors that ought to be conferred upon him, statues and monumental memorials for the purpose of commemorating the immense benefits that he had conferred upon mankind.

It is utterly preposterous and absurd to tell any sensible man who uses barbed wire for inclosing his ground that he ought to pay \$16.80 a ton to the patentees of New England for using that simple invention. It is the veriest nonsense that ever was uttered. But we are asked, in addition to the tariff imposed in the first place upon the raw material, then to pay this exorbitant royalty to the inventor; but afterward, should the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey prevail, we shall be subjected to the still greater addition of more than \$33 a ton to exclude the product of the foreign manufacturer who draws the wire, and in drawing it allows it to pass through a thin bath of zinc or some other metal so that it may be coated to avoid oxidation. Thus there are three imposts, one after the other, all of them a direct burden upon the men who use it; but that is not all.

These people live at a great distance from the source whence these articles are supplied. After they have been thus burdened with these three great imposts what further occurs? They are compelled to bear the additional expense of a vast and extortionate sum for the transportation to the ground where it is to be used. Yet those of us who live in the producing portion of this country, who raise seven-eighths of all the products that we export, who pay three-fourths of your taxes, are told that all this is for the benefit of American industry, and that we ought to be thankful for the opportunities that are offered us of paying these great impositions and bending our backs to those intolerable burdens.

I have, as I said the other night, no sympathy whatever with the doctrines of free trade or of a tariff for revenue only. I know as well as the most stringent protectionist that to make free trade equitable there must be equality of conditions, equality of climate, equality of soil, equality of wages, equality of interest, equality of accumulated capital, and equality of facilities for reaching the markets of the world. I understand all that, sir; but when you tell the producing classes of this country that their burdens are only equal to those borne by the people who live in the manufacturing portions of this land, they are intelligent enough to know the contrary, and none of the sophistry, none of the blandishment, none of the poetry of the Senator from Massachusetts or any of his associates upon this subject will lead them to believe that they are not subject to a vastly greater share of the burdens of this Government than they ought to bear, and they never will be at rest until they have secured an equalization of its burdens.

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, the clause that he has inserted for the purpose, as I suppose, of persuading those who represent agricultural States that they can safely afford to vote for it, I assure him that it is a delusion and a snare. There is no wire imported as fence-wire; it is described in the tariff schedules as of a certain gauge. Certain gauges are used for fence; certain other gauges are used for telegraphy; certain portions are used for manufacturing wire rope; and to say that the definition in parentheses that fence-wire shall be free from duty would be of any advantage is simply without foundation, because there is no wire known as fence-wire. It can be imported for any purpose that the purchaser pleases. If he buys it as telegraph-wire it may be used for fencing or it may be used for making wire rope.

Therefore I can see no reason why any person, whether he believes in free trade or protection, should vote for that. Beyond this the tax that is proposed to be levied upon this product is monstrously extortionate and excessive. I believe the Senator proposes upon the wire to levy a tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Is that correct?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Upon steel wire of this character. [Exhibiting.] The Senator will observe that there are more than 1,000 strands of wire in that.

Mr. INGALLS. Let me see the amendment.

Mr. MCPHERSON. On steel-wire rope $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, on iron-wire rope 1 cent a pound. It is a very fine quality of wire used for certain special purposes.

Mr. INGALLS. "There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence-wire, and except also tin-plates, terne-plates, and tagger-tin, hereinbefore provided for), when galvanized or coated with any metal, alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act." That is to say, if it is galvanized by this simple process of running the wire as it is drawn through a bath or solution of melted metal, it is to pay the sum of \$11.20 per ton. Is that correct?

Mr. MCPHERSON. That is correct.

Mr. INGALLS. In addition to the royalty of \$16.80 to the patentee it is to pay the additional duty of \$11.20 if it is coated or galvanized with zinc or any other metal.

Mr. MCPHERSON. And at the present price of zinc with which it is coated or galvanized it can not be done profitably at that rate.

Mr. INGALLS. I should be very much surprised indeed to learn that. In fact I have been advised by those who are competent to instruct me that it is not possible that it can cost to coat this wire with zinc or any other metal in solution over one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

On iron wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made.

That is to say \$22.40 additional.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I wish to state to the Senator that if you take the wire that has been used in the construction of the Brooklyn bridge, for instance, to illustrate by the cost to the parties who took the contract to do that, it cost more than 1 cent a pound to make the wire from the wire strand, and unless some provision of this kind is inserted in the bill, you can import wire rope just as cheap as you can the material from which it is made.

Mr. INGALLS. "On steel wire rope and wire strand $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire from which it is made." That is to say, \$33.60 per ton in addition to the duty upon the wire. I have a very profound regard for the interests of American industry, but I have this to say, that if upon the simple necessities of daily life, if upon these articles which are essential to the continuation of our civilization it is necessary upon this theory of the protection of American labor and American industry to impose these burdens upon the people who get no equivalent in return, we had better abandon the idea altogether and allow these things to be manufactured abroad and come in free of duty.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed to detain the Senate, to address the Senate so frequently as I have upon this subject, but I ought not to let the observations of the Senator from Kansas go by without a single further remark.

The Senator speaks of sophistry and the burdens upon the farmer. What is the proposition here so far as I have discussed it? It is a proposition to put a quarter of a cent per pound, three-fourths of a cent a rod upon wire fence, a ton of which would make about seven hundred rods, as an equivalent for a duty which in the same bill you have placed at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, or $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents a rod upon the material of which this galvanizing process is made. That is the proposition. That is the burden, and that is the appeal to the justice of the farmers of America.

Mr. INGALLS. That is a part of the burden.

Mr. HOAR. That is the burden which we are discussing, and that is the whole of it, not a part of it. You have taken this process of galvanizing or dipping in zinc, and you have said for every rod of wire fence using three pounds of zinc the manufacturer of this fence shall pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents of duty for his material, saying nothing about the cost of his putting it on, and thereupon we say give us at least an advantage of one-fourth of a cent a pound, or three-fourths of a cent a rod as a partial equivalent. The Senator from Kansas undertakes to divert the Senate by an argument in which he speaks of me as using sophistries, appealing to the justice of men talking about the duty on pig-iron. Does the new manufacturer of wire, does the manufacturer of anything in New England receive that duty on pig-iron? He pays it.

Mr. INGALLS. No, the consumer pays it.

Mr. HOAR. He pays it before he begins his manufacture of it, and for every ton of material there goes to the Pennsylvanian or the Ohio man or to the Missourian who produces the pig-iron this duty of \$6.50 advance. Then comes the next step, the Bessemer steel, the steel rod, or the steel bar; and that, too, is protected by a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem, just placed by the action of the Senate. None of these things are for the advantage of the New England manufacturer; they are the burdens which he carries upon his shoulders when he begins his process, and how unfair, how unjust, how sophistical it is to undertake to allude to those things when we are asking for this simple protection!

Mr. President, under this bill, largely made up by the assistance of the Senator from Kansas, largely made up by the assistance and with the concurrence of Senators who are voting against us, you can take this wire when it is made from the American workshop, carry it across the Atlantic, galvanize it in England, pay the freights both ways, and bring it back and sell it at a less amount than the duty which you compel us to pay on our zinc which is used in the process of galvanizing, for the benefit of the zinc producers of Missouri and Southwestern Virginia and Illinois. I do not believe that there is a farmer on this continent who would think that was just. I do not believe there is a farmer on this continent who would say that he was not willing to pay the little expense of three-fourths of a cent a rod on his wire fence rather than be made a party to that injustice.

In regard to another thing to which the Senator from Kansas adverted, I did not say and I never have said that the mere process of inventing the barbing of wire fence or the mere process of weaving two single straight strands of wire into one constituted the inventor the mighty benefactor of the human race. I do say that the result of this most intricate, delicate, and beautiful mechanism, using a combination of labor of the highest skill and of mechanism of the greatest ingenuity, has been to substitute for the blacksmith hammering out the bar with the power of his right arm, and then taking the cold wire and drawing it with pinchers through a single block (which was done within the memory of living men at a cost probably of several hundred dollars a ton, I do not know what the cost of the wire then was), the reducing it by this cheap process by which the fences of this country are now furnished,

posts and all, for a little over 50 cents a rod—I say that is one of the greatest benefits conferred on the human race, and especially conferred on that most honorable and eminent portion of the human race who obtain their living by agricultural pursuits. I say that the men whose combined genius has produced that result in the mechanical arts of life are men far more deserving of honor or of statues, or of praise in a Senate which represent the people of a republic, than the occupant of Blenheim House or of Apsley House, or any of the victories which England has won and has recompensed by title, and rank, and fortune.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to what I wish to state, based on information acquired in business for myself and for some of my neighbors. I have had some experience in the purchase of this barbed wire. I have looked into it a little. It costs at the factories when we buy it at what is called the wholesale 9½ or 9¼ cents a pound, I do not remember which. I put it at 9½ cents; that makes a ton of this wire cost at the factory, without any transportation, \$212.80.

Mr. PLUMB. I know the Senator does not want to fall into an error, but either he has done so or something very extraordinary has occurred in his buying of this wire. The highest and best kind of the barbed wire sells at retail, that is by the single coil, in Kansas, for 9 cents a pound; that is the galvanized wire.

Mr. GEORGE. I have purchased it in Cincinnati at 9½ cents.

Mr. COKE. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I have purchased galvanized fence wire in Texas at retail and by the coil, and have paid 11 and 11½ cents a pound for it.

Mr. PLUMB. Eighteen cents might have been paid for it, but the ordinary painted wire sells at 8 cents, and galvanized wire at 9 cents by the single coil.

Mr. GEORGE. I am speaking of galvanized wire.

Mr. PLUMB. I am speaking of galvanized wire which I have bought within a recent period.

Mr. GEORGE. It costs us at Cincinnati 9½ cents a pound, which makes \$212.80 a ton. But this is the statement to which I desire specially to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts. I understand from authority which I believe to be good that the machine which performs this wonderful work of putting the barbs on the wire is patented and belongs to one man, or a company of men, and that although there are various factories in the United States in which the barbed wire is made, there is not only a royalty paid on all that is made, but the owner of the patent in addition to that, I understand it to be the fact, absolutely fixes the minimum price at which the wire is to be sold; or, in other words, that those who pay him a royalty of three-fourths of a cent per pound are not permitted to compete with him, as he has a factory, too, or with others who have similar factories, in the markets; and that he fixes absolutely the minimum price, below which these manufacturers are not allowed to sell. Is that a fact or not? Does the Senator know whether that is a fact?

Mr. COKE. I will state to the Senator that it has been represented to me as he states it by those who sell barbed wire in Texas.

Mr. GEORGE. If that be the fact this is, if anything can be, a most odious monopoly. It is just the same thing precisely as if there were but one factory in the United States, belonging to one man or one company, having the absolute power of fixing the price at just such sums as the manufacturer sees proper.

Mr. HOAR. How does it differ from every other patent under our patent laws? The Constitution of the United States provides that we shall promote the interests of the mechanic arts, and that is one of the wisest and most beneficent clauses in the Constitution, by granting to inventors for limited periods the exclusive use of their inventions. I know nothing about the particular thing which the Senator alludes to, but what he says is merely a translation of that clause of the Constitution which applies to every invention.

Mr. GEORGE. The Constitution authorizes us to give the inventor a monopoly in the use of his patent, but he ought to be satisfied with that and not require of us to increase that monopoly by putting a high protective or a prohibitory duty upon the articles out of which the wire is made. One monopoly is enough; one advantage is enough; he has got that under the patent law.

Mr. HOAR. Then the Senator's proposition is, if I understand him, as he appealed to me, I will take the liberty of interposing—

Mr. GEORGE. Of course.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator's proposition is that whatever else should be benefited by protection, or by revenue with incidental protection, to use the Democratic phrase, the inventors of this country are never to be benefited in that way. If a man has a patent, his industry is not to share in the advantage of protection or of revenue with incidental protection.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not my proposition, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. Why not, will the Senator explain? The Senator seems to have abandoned his first proposition, that it is a monopoly under the Constitution and was an exceedingly odious thing. I do not understand that he reaffirms that; but now he says that, while he will not state that, he will say that the patentee should not be advantaged by the protective system. At least that is what I understand my friend to say. I should like to see why he does not say it.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will listen he will understand what

I mean. I meant to say that while he has a patent under the laws and under the Constitution of the United States, I would not interfere with that, because he has a legal right to it; but I do say that having that advantage he has no right to come before the Senate and ask as a protection to his industry, in order to enable him to make more money than he can make out of his patent, an additional protection. I say his patent is a sufficient protection to him, and he ought not to have any more.

Mr. HOAR. If the honorable Senator will permit me (and I would not interrupt him except for his appealing to me when he made the argument) nobody is saying that thing in this case. These people have a patent, or rather there have been several hundred inventions going to the perfection of this wonderful mechanism, some of which are still covered by patents and receive royalty. What they are talking about now is that when they galvanize their wire, which is not a patent process, you have no right in common honesty or common decency to say that they shall pay 4½ cents protection for every rod they make of wire fencing as an advantage to the English galvanizer of wire without some little corresponding protection on their part. They say, in other words, that when you give them your patent, whatever justice requires, it is not at least decent to knock it on the head by putting 4½ cents a rod protection in favor of the English manufacturer who competes with their patent. That is the proposition we are discussing now. Will you give us a drawback on the zinc we use?

Mr. SLATER. How much zinc does it take?

Mr. HOAR. It takes a pound of zinc to galvanize a rod of fence.

Mr. GEORGE. This is a big monopoly. It is what you may call an extraordinary monopoly. The patentee in this case does what no other patentee I ever heard of does. He does not sell the right for a royalty to everybody who wants to go into the market and make this barbed wire and allow the price to be brought down by the fair and open competition of the persons to whom he has sold the right and to whom he charges the royalty, but he assumes in his contract to fix a minimum below which these parties, however beneficial it might be to them and to their consumers to sell below, are not allowed to sell. I say that a company or a single individual who has thus secured a monopoly under the Constitution and under the laws in the shape of a patent-right, and who has thus abused, as I believe it, his patent-right by undertaking to fix a minimum price below which it shall not be sold, has no right to come before this body and ask us to impose additional burdens upon the consumers of this article by granting him additional protection. That is my idea.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask my honorable friend a question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, for a question.

Mr. HOAR. Suppose the Senator were himself to be the owner of a patent-right. Suppose he sold that right to use the thing in different States, would he permit, after he had sold the right and exacted the royalty from one man, another buyer of the same thing to undersell that person and drive him out of the market; or would he affix a reasonable stipulation of this kind? Is not that the universal practice of patentees?

Mr. GEORGE. I understand it is not the universal practice. I understand that these patent-rights are sold with reference to certain localities; that a man has a right for a State or a county, or for two States or five States, or in that way; but I understand that when he becomes the owner of a patent, after he pays the royalty, he has ordinarily a right to sell it at just such price as he pleases.

Why is it—and I want an answer to this question—with his three-quarters of a cent per pound royalty that he interferes with the natural right of the manufacturer of the wire by fixing a price below which it may not be sold, not above which he may charge as much as he pleases to the consumer. He has a right to charge enormous rates, enormous profits, but he has no right to go below the minimum. That is the arrangement which has been made; and I undertake to say that when a company which has thus got the monopoly of manufacturing so useful an article as barbed wire not only attempts but actually succeeds in fixing an arbitrary price without reference to the cost of the article, without reference to the cost of the labor on it, or without reference to the cost of material used in it, fixes an arbitrary price below which no consumer can ever acquire it or procure it—I say when he does that he has no right to come here and ask that we give him an additional power, an additional benefit, an additional advantage over the consumer. I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will not prevail.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, on the present and former occasions this barbed-wire question has consumed considerable time of the Senate. I think it quite as dangerous to Senators as it is to stock. So far as I am concerned, I am as full of information as I can hold on this subject, and I think that the average Senator has reached some conclusion upon the point, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

Mr. HOAR called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). On this subject I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. I do not know how he would vote, and I still less know how I would vote myself.

Mr. SLATER (when Mr. GROVER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GROVER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KELLOGG]. The Senator from Louisiana was paired with me, and I have transferred the pair to my colleague.

Mr. BAYARD (when Mr. HALE's name was called). The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PENDLETON]. I was requested to announce the pair.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I was paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. He is not in his seat, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK].

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. RANSOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. I do not know how he would vote, and I therefore refrain from voting.

Mr. WALKER (when his name was called). I was paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL], but the pair is transferred to the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY], who is indisposed. If present, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. PUGH. I was requested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] to state that he is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. BECK. My colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS] is necessarily absent, and I desire to announce his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio has voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to say that I did not notice the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Indeed, I supposed my pair was out. I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—16.

Aldrich,
Anthony,
Cameron of Wis.,
Conger,

Dawes,
Frye,
Hawley,
Hoar,

Jones of Nevada,
McMillan,
Miller of N. Y.,
Morrill,

Platt,
Rollins,
Sewell,
Tabor.

NAYS—27.

Bayard,
Beck,
Call,
Cockrell,
Coke,
Davis of Ill.,
Davis of W. Va.,

Farley,
George,
Gorman,
Groome,
Hampton,
Harris,
Harrison,

Ingalls,
Jackson,
Jonas,
Jones of Florida,
McDill,
Miller of Cal.,
Plumb,

Pugh,
Slater,
Vance,
Vest,
Voorhees,
Walker.

ABSENT—33.

Allison,
Barrow,
Blair,
Brown,
Butler,
Camden,
Cameron of Pa.,
Edmunds,
Fair,

Ferry,
Garland,
Grover,
Hale,
Hill,
Johnston,
Kellogg,
Lamar,
Lapham,

Logan,
McPherson,
Mahone,
Maxey,
Mitchell,
Morgan,
Pendleton,
Ransom,
Saulsbury,

Saunders,
Sawyer,
Sherman,
Van Wyck,
Williams,
Windom.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

Mr. BECK. Let it be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out on page 36, from line 788 down to and including line 800—

Mr. EDMUNDS. Read the proviso to be stricken out.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the following proviso:

And provided further, That wire rope and wire strand, of iron or steel wire, shall pay the same rates of duty that are levied on the wire of which they are made and one-fourth of 1 cent per pound additional: *And provided further*, That on all of the kinds of iron or steel, or articles or manufactures of iron or steel, hereinbefore in this act enumerated, except fence-wire when galvanized or coated with any metal or alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatsoever, not including paints, there shall be paid (excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates,terne-plates, and taggers-tin, and hereinbefore provided for), one-fourth cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence-wire, and except also tin-plates,terne-plates, and taggers-tin, hereinbefore provided for), when galvanized or coated with any metal alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatsoever (not including paints), one-half of 1 cent per pound, in addition to the rates provided in this act. On iron wire or iron wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound, in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made. On steel wire or steel wire rope and wire strand, 1½ cents per pound, in addition to the rates imposed on the wire from which it is made.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BECK. The Senator from New Jersey seeks additional rates of duty. The wire that he exhibits I believe is No. 26, most of it, and some of it the very finest wire. We have already imposed a duty of 3 cents a pound, \$67.20 a ton, on all that character of wire, and now he wants \$33.60 a ton or 1½ cents a pound more, making it over \$100 a ton, and it is all for the benefit of one or more corporations or bridge companies, when the galvanizing process when run through does not require any cleansing or any scouring or anything of that kind, and it does not cost half a cent a pound to do it. An argument was made before the committee, I think in behalf of the Brooklyn Bridge Company, and we were asked to give one-half a cent. We thought a quarter of a cent enough, and so reported. I should like to hear why we should pay \$100 a ton duty on that character of wire. I have not heard any Senator give a reason yet.

Mr. McPHERSON. I do not know what the Senator means by saying that any one appeared before the committee and asked for half a cent. Certainly nobody appeared before the committee, nobody was permitted to appear before the committee, nobody did appear before the committee and state anything about it. I know from those who are engaged in the manufacture of wire rope that on the average it costs them the amount I have named in the amendment to manufacture the wire rope from the wire strand, as appears in the samples I hold in my hand. These are samples of steel wire, in which it will be noticed that the wire is as fine as possible, as fine as a hair. Elevator cord is made out of it and various other articles of the very finest texture. It does seem to me perfectly absurd, if this tariff bill is to be constructed upon a basis of strict equality as between the different stages of manufacture, that the Senate should be willing to leave this industry without any notice whatever while other industries have been noticed. I know it was stated before the committee that it would not cost more than a quarter of a cent a pound to do it. I believe the gentleman who appeared before the committee was a member of the commission and he professed to know something in regard to it, but about it he really knew nothing. Against that you have the statement of gentlemen who are engaged in this manufacture. This is all I have to say about it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The roll will be called on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN (when Mr. BARROW's name was called). I desire to announce once more that my colleague [Mr. BARROW] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR]. The pair is to last during the day.

Mr. BROWN (when his name was called). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN].

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). On this subject I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK]. I would vote "yea," if he were here.

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM].

Mr. BAYARD (when Mr. PENDLETON's name was called). The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PENDLETON] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. RANSOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. I do not know how he would vote. I should vote "nay."

Mr. SHERMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WALKER (when his name was called). My colleague [Mr. GARLAND] is paired for the present. He would vote "nay." I announce also the pair of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. If the Senator from Texas were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There are not votes enough to make a quorum.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will vote as I suppose the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote if present. I vote "nay."

YEAS—8.

Cameron of Wis.,
Conger,

Dawes,
Frye,

Miller of N. Y.,
Platt,

Sewell,
Tabor.

NAYS—32.

Aldrich,
Anthony,
Bayard,
Beck,
Call,
Cockrell,
Coke,
Davis of Ill.,

Davis of W. Va.,
Edmunds,
Farley,
George,
Gorman,
Groome,
Hampton,
Harris,

Harrison,
Hawley,
Ingalls,
Jackson,
Jonas,
Jones of Florida,
McDill,
McMillan,

Morrill,
Plumb,
Pugh,
Rollins,
Sherman,
Slater,
Vance,
Walker.

ABSENT—36.

Allison,
Barrow,
Blair,
Brown,
Butler,
Camden,
Cameron of Pa.,
Fair,
Ferry,

Garland,
Grover,
Hale,
Hill,
Hoar,
Johnston,
Jones of Nevada,
Kellogg,
Lamar,

Lapham,
Logan,
McPherson,
Mahone,
Maxey,
Miller of Cal.,
Mitchell,
Morgan,
Pendleton,

Ransom,
Saulsbury,
Saunders,
Sawyer,
Van Wyck,
Vest,
Voorhees,
Williams,
Windom.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have repeatedly announced that, in my opinion, we should raise the amount of revenue necessary to an economical administration of the Government by a tariff, and not by direct taxation nor internal taxation. We must either tax the people indirectly by tariff to raise the necessary amount, or we must tax them directly to collect the same amount. In either case they must pay tax necessary to support the Government. In both cases the amount necessary to its support is the same. I would raise that amount as our fathers raised it and as the Democratic party when in power raised it before the war, by a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection to American labor.

In adjusting the tariff I would, as a rule, admit free of taxation such articles produced abroad as we do not produce at home, so as not to protect foreign labor in our markets by an increase of the price of their productions to the detriment of home labor. To this rule I would make a few exceptions, in case of articles of luxury used only by the wealthy class. For instance, I would put a reasonable tax on rosewood, mahogany, fine wines, broadcloths, and like articles not raised or made in this country, and used only by the rich; and to the extent of the revenue raised on such luxuries I would reduce the tax on some of the articles of prime necessity used generally by the poorer classes.

On the other hand, after making up the free-list on the basis just mentioned, I would impose the tax by tariff to support the Government as a rule on such articles produced abroad as we produce at home, thus giving to American labor incidental protection to the extent of the amount of tariff levied. To illustrate, hemp is raised abroad and imported into this country. Hemp is also produced in this country. Now, if we put a tariff of 20 per cent. ad valorem upon imported hemp it costs the foreign importer \$20 to land in our markets \$100 worth of hemp, and he must sell it in our markets for \$120 instead of \$100, which, if there were no tariff, would be its market value. This fixes the price and enables the American producer to sell the same quantity of hemp of the same quality for \$120, which he could only have sold for \$100 had there been no tariff. This puts in the Treasury toward the support of the Government \$20, and gives the American hemp producer in the sale of his hemp \$20 of incidental protection, and it prevents the collection of the \$20 by the tax-collector under a direct-tax law levying a tax on the property of the citizen to aid in the support of the Government. If the \$20 is not raised by a tariff on the hemp of the foreign importer, it must be raised by a direct tax on the land or the personal property of the American hemp producer or other citizen.

But to this last-mentioned mode of imposing the tariff on articles of foreign production which are also produced by our own citizens I would make some exceptions, and as the exceptions to the rule first mentioned apply to articles produced abroad and not produced at home, which are luxuries, used chiefly by the rich, I would in the last class exempt from tax certain articles of prime necessity in general use by the poor. To illustrate, I would admit salt, which is produced at home and abroad, free of all tax, because it is an article of absolute necessity; the poorest family in the poorest cabin in all this broad land are absolutely obliged to have it; next to the air we breathe it is the most indispensable necessity to every man, woman, and child in the land. I therefore move, Mr. President, on page 80 of the bill, commencing with line 1861, to strike out the following language:

Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 10 cents per one hundred pounds; in bulk, 6 cents per one hundred pounds.

And I move to insert in lieu of that language:

Salt shall be placed on the free-list.

And now, Mr. President, under the rule I have laid down as in my opinion the correct one I desire also to give notice that I shall move at the proper time to make other amendments increasing the rates of tariff fixed in this bill on several articles of luxury used by the wealthy classes alone. In my opinion we should compel those who use these luxuries to pay a higher rate of tax, so as to reduce to that extent the tax on salt and other necessities of life indispensable to the comfort of the poorer classes.

On page 51, at line 1156, I find:

Champagne, and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than one quart and more than one pint, \$6 per dozen bottles.

I give notice I shall move to increase that to \$8 a dozen bottles, and then the other classes of champagne in about the like proportion.

Still wines, in casks, 40 cents per gallon.

I give notice that I shall move to increase that to 50 cents per gallon, and other grades in like proportion.

Cordials, liquors, &c., on page 53, I find are taxed \$2 per gallon. I shall move to strike out "\$2" and insert "\$2.50 per gallon."

On page 56 I find:

Cotton laces, embroideries, &c.

I shall move to make that 50 per cent. ad valorem.

On page 63 I find:

Woolen cloths, woolen shawls, including broadcloths, &c.

Which now pay an ad valorem of 71.60 per cent. as I find by looking at the list. I shall move to make that 75 per cent. ad valorem. On page 67, taking the different finer grades of carpets, I shall move to make an increase in the tariff proposed by this bill on each of the finer grades, but not on the lower grades used by our people generally.

On page 68, providing for a tariff upon silks, I shall move to change the rate from 50 per cent. ad valorem as proposed in this bill, and make it 70 per cent. ad valorem, and to put a tariff of 20 per cent. ad valorem then upon the cocoons, the raw material.

On page 77 I shall move to make the tax on jewelry 35 per cent. ad valorem instead of 25 per cent. ad valorem.

I see by looking at the present tariff imposed upon these different articles that the bill before the Senate does not propose to make any change in the rate of tariff now collected on fine brandies and fine wines. As they are used as I have said almost exclusively by the wealthy and those who are well able to pay the tariff upon them, I think there should be an increase and a like amount taken off prime articles of necessity that are used by our people generally. The same rule applies to the fine imported brandies, and cordials. I see that during the last year there were imported into this country an amount of champagne wines that paid \$620,683.57 of revenue.

The present tariff on champagne is the same as now proposed by this bill. It yielded last year a revenue of \$620,683.57.

Still wines paid last year a revenue of \$2,172,703.58. It was an ad valorem rate of about 60 per cent. This bill proposes to continue the same rate.

Brandy and other spirits paid last year a revenue of \$2,878,608.09 on an ad valorem of about 146 per cent.

Cordials last year paid a revenue of \$246,447.55 on an ad valorem of about 140 per cent.

Under the present tariff the finer class of woollens, including broadcloths, &c., pay 50 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, making an average ad valorem equivalent to about 71 per cent. The proposed tariff reduces this to about 65 per cent. ad valorem. I think as these fine cloths are used by the class of society well able to pay for them, the tariff on broadcloths and the finer goods ought to have been retained at its present rate if not increased. During the last year we collected from these articles \$9,076,164.77 of revenue. Why not still collect that amount on them. Those who use them are well able to pay the tax. They are not articles of prime necessity. They may well be classed as luxuries. Let those who use them pay the tax. It will take that amount off of other articles which those much less able to pay tax are obliged to use.

On carpets of two or three of the finer grades, for instance the Aubusson, Axminster, &c., the present tariff is 50 per cent; the proposed tariff is 45 cents per square yard and 30 per cent. ad valorem; this would be 33 and a fraction ad valorem, making a heavy reduction in that article. It yielded last year \$234,980.50.

Saxony, Wilton, &c., are taxed under the present tariff 70 cents per square yard and 35 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 79.71 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 45 cents per square yard and 30 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 52.96 per cent. ad valorem. This article yielded last year \$26,559.

On Brussels carpets the present tariff is 44 cents per square yard and 35 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 70.88 per cent.; the proposed tariff is 30 cents per square yard and 30 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 54.46 per cent. They yielded last year \$95,209.61.

On patent velvet and tapestry velvet, &c., the present tariff is 40 cents per square yard and 35 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 69.88 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 25 cents per square yard and 30 per cent. ad valorem, equivalent to 51.80 per cent. ad valorem. The tax collected on it last year was \$43,898.50.

On silk—all goods, wares, &c., not specially enumerated—the present tariff is 50 and 60 per cent., equivalent to 59.13 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 50 per cent. ad valorem. It yielded last year \$22,574,442.62. I would make it 70 per cent., as already stated, and 20 per cent. on cocoons or the raw and reeled silk. This would give 20 per cent. encouragement to our women and children who produce cocoons and raw silk, which this bill puts on the free list.

On jewelry the present tariff is 25 and 30 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 25 per cent. ad valorem. It yielded last year \$103,244.52.

On cotton laces, &c., the present tariff is 35 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 40 per cent. ad valorem. It yielded last year \$2,334,798.78.

The article of fine lace is used almost entirely by the wealthier classes of society who do not feel the difference of rate in a tariff, and I would put the tariff up to a higher rate. Let it be paid by them and make a corresponding reduction on some of the prime necessities of life used by the poorer classes.

In the matter of salt, which I have moved to strike from this part of the bill and put on the free-list, I find that the present tariff is as follows:

On salt in bags the present tariff is 12 cents per hundred pounds, or 36.43 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed tariff is 10 cents per hundred pounds, equivalent to 30.36 per cent. ad valorem. On salt in bulk the present tariff is 8 cents per hundred pounds, equivalent to 24.24 per cent. ad valorem; which is certainly a very high rate upon one of the prime necessities of life. The proposed tariff is 6 cents per hundred pounds, equivalent to 18.18 per cent. ad valorem. The two items or classes of salt together yielded last year \$715,243.13.

Why reduce the tariff on luxuries and still collect a tax on salt, which everybody is obliged to have? A man can live without coffee, sugar, tea, fine clothes or fine brandy; but every one must have salt. As it is almost as necessary to human life as the air we breathe, let us make it as free of taxation as the air. It should, in my opinion, be made an exception to all rules that may require that it be taxed. It is no reply to say that the articles of luxury to which I have referred are now taxed all they will bear. As the tariff now stands they paid into the Treasury over \$40,000,000 of revenue last year. The present tariff is not prohibitory. The wealthier class would pay a higher tariff and still use all they desire of each class of luxuries now used by them. Why lighten their taxes to the injury of the great laboring and producing classes of our people? I am not willing to do it.

I would take the tax off salt although it is an article that is produced in this country as well as in foreign countries; but on account of the prime necessity, the fact that everybody is obliged to use it, I would put it on the free-list; and on these other articles of luxury of which I have given notice, on all of which footed up the revenue last year was over \$40,000,000, I would not only put on enough to make the amount we take off salt, but I would go further and take off the taxes on some other articles of necessity and lay higher taxes on these and other luxuries.

Mr. MORRILL. May I inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether he intends these amendments for this bill or for the one that is to be proposed at the next session of Congress?

Mr. BROWN. I intend them for this bill. I see that the Senator from Vermont is now getting in great haste about the passage of this bill. I have watched this thing more than a month. I said to some friends more than a month ago that I was satisfied that the chairman of the committee would not carry this bill through Congress, and the reason for it was this: complaint was made occasionally that there were too many points made on the Democratic side and that the speeches on minor points or unimportant points were long. I do not say whether it was a just complaint in any case; but I think it very natural if the chairman intended to carry this bill through, when long arguments were made on trivial points, that he should get up and make clear, short statements simply of the points in the case and say to us that he thought we were consuming time unnecessarily, "and when you are done discussing it we will take a vote." But instead of that, my observation was that if we made one rather long speech on this side on a point that was a little trivial we usually had about two or three in return from that side; we would discuss for a whole day a very small, unimportant amendment. This thing has been kept up on one side as well as the other, so that neither can say that it is the other's fault. Hence during all the time I have come to the conclusion that my friend from Vermont is not in very great haste to pass this bill, as his questions now would seem to indicate. I may be mistaken about it.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer an amendment which I think will come in appropriately at this moment of time. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The proposed amendment will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out so much of the bill as is described as section 2503 and insert the following:

That on and after the 1st day of July, 1883, and until the 1st day of July, 1884, there shall be levied, collected, and paid 85 per cent. of the rates of duty which are now required under the existing laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States; and on and after the 1st day of July, 1884, there shall be levied, collected, and paid 75 per cent. of the rates of duties now required under the existing laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. That would be section 6 of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want to antagonize the Senator from Alabama in his proposition to take up his amendment, though when he introduced it to-day I expected it to be presented at a later stage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that if his amendment proposes to strike out the whole tariff legislation in this bill, while it is in order for him at this time to offer the amendment, every amendment that proposes to perfect the text will take precedence of it and have to be voted upon before the question can be put upon his amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. I appreciate the value of that suggestion from the Chair. I desire to offer it now and hope the Senate will consider it now, for the reason that it seems that we are going on to offer a great many amendments to this bill, as each Senator has the right to do of course, and the debate may be protracted to a great length.

I entirely concur with the Senator from Georgia. I have no faith at all that there was any serious intention to pass a tariff bill, unless it might be merely to force it through one of the Houses during this session of Congress. The immense sweep that this bill has taken, the great number of subjects that have been presented, the laborious efforts of the committee at its explanation, the difficulty of understanding all of its labyrinthian twistings and turnings, have been so great that we have recognized the impossibility, after this body shall have considered it, of having it considered by the House of Representatives in anything like regular order. The House of Representatives are considering a sort of parallel measure and are coming to their conclusions upon it; but this bill can never reach the House in time to have it properly considered as such a measure should be in that body. That fact is apparent to everybody.

Therefore I have been led to despair of giving to the country any of that relief which it has so urgently demanded through the ballot-box, through the public press, and through other means, in the revision of the tariff, unless it can be reached through the medium of an amendment of the character that I now suggest; that is, an amendment which will reduce the tariff pro rata, say 10 or 15 per cent. during the first year, and 10 or 15 per cent. during the second year, giving to the people of the United States time under this revision and reduction to examine into the subject and to instruct and assist their members in the House and in the Senate in the readjustment of their industrial relations to the new order of things.

The Senate of the United States have never before undertaken a general system of tariff reduction and revision. We have presented to us now for the first time in our history a necessity for reducing the amount of revenue gathered into our Treasury annually by a cutting down of taxation. It is a peculiar condition that we are placed in, and one that demands of us very great circumspection and caution. We find that under existing circumstances it is even more difficult to reduce a rate of taxation levied through a tariff or through internal-tax laws so as to accommodate the reduced tax to a new condition of affairs than it is to originate a new measure of taxation which will bring a needed amount of money into the Treasury. In this work of reduction we have to anticipate with far greater care than we would in the matter of the increase of the tariff, and particularly where the tariff is put upon new subjects of taxation, for the reason that the industries of the country for twenty years past have been founding themselves by a natural process upon an existing state of the law. Capital has been invested; labor, skilled and otherwise, has been employed around these manufacturing centers; families have been established about them; business and social relations have been adjusted to various occupations founded upon our tariff system of legislation. It has in a degree permeated every class of society and every industry in the land, and when we come to the work of cutting down the amount of revenue that is to be derived annually from this system of laws and the reducing of protection under which these industries have heretofore existed and have prospered, we are embarrassed with the difficulty of adjusting these so as not to disturb unnecessarily or rudely or harshly any existing rights or interests of our people. Every Senator must understand, it seems to me, from his own observation that we are now engaged in the most difficult of all the endeavors of the legislator and the statesman.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. The Senator knows that his amendment will cut down articles embraced in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. MORGAN. My amendment, if the Senator from Florida will consider it for a moment, is a mere reduction of 15 per cent. as I propose it for the first year, and 10 per cent. more the second year upon the rates of the existing tariff. I give two years for the purpose of accomplishing that which has been suggested so frequently of late, the giving repose to the country while we are carrying this system into operation. That is my object precisely. There is a danger when we are reducing a tariff of creating alarm. There is danger of frightening capital, and of breaking up the good-will of established lines of trade, of stopping industries, and of putting a curb upon genius, especially upon inventive genius, while you are reducing a tariff, and while you are accommodating these industries to the new situation. So I would include the period of at least two years in the plan of reduction, and I would allow the people during that period of time to have a fair opportunity, while the graduation was being made, to look into the actual effect upon all these various industries.

The bill came from the Committee on Finance, and in some of its most important features has been reconsidered by that committee after debate in the Senate, and the committee have come back with changed and modified provisions upon the sugar tariff, upon the tariff upon woolen and cotton goods and other subjects. The committee finding that their researches and their very remarkable industry in the investigations of these numerous complicated questions had not resulted in conclusions which were entirely satisfactory to themselves, have come and asked the Senate in an informal way to recommit certain portions of this great bill to them, and from time to time they have reviewed their own action, have reconsidered it, and have reported different conclusions from those that were at first presented in the bill as being satisfactory to them.

After we had gone along through weeks of discussion and examination, and the committee amendments to the original sections of the bill had been all considered in Committee of the Whole, then the bill came into the Senate, and I believe that it has been here now a full week, or perhaps a longer time even, and the committee during the time since the bill has been reported from the Committee of the Whole back to the Senate have had almost the exclusive possession of the floor. No very important question has so far been presented for the consideration of the Senate except at the instance of the committee or members of the committee, and no later than this morning we discussed, upon the motion of the Senator from Ohio, some very important propositions for a change in the schedule of metals, which he insisted (though the Senator from Kentucky controverted that proposition) he had the authority of the committee for offering in form.

So that the committee work, whether formal or informal, upon this bill has terminated only since the commencement of our session this morning at 11 o'clock.

Now, the Senator from Georgia comes forward with a number of propositions, each one of which strikes me with force. The propositions of that Senator are in themselves valuable. They have received from him, I have no doubt, great consideration, and coming as emanations from his own thoughts alone, without reference to any opinions I may have formed about them, I should consider them as entitled to the respect of this body. Not one proposition has been suggested by that Senator which would not, if it should be adopted, in my judgment be a material benefit to this measure. There is not one of them that would not greatly benefit this country. There is not one of them that is not in the line of reformation of our tariff system of revenue. There is not one of them that does not lift burdens from the shoulders of the great laboring masses of the country, and place them on those who are more able than they are to bear them. I have no doubt that other Senators have measures which they have matured in their own minds, equally beneficial when considered in connection with this bill.

Since we commenced our session this morning the Senate have really had their first opportunity to be heard in this matter. I have amendments lying upon this desk now that are as much as three weeks' old, which I have never had the opportunity of presenting, although they have been in print and have been called to the attention of the Senate. Under our system of procedure our rules compel individual Senators to defer their action until the Committee on Finance have had their first opportunity to amend the bill to suit themselves; and even now, when I offer this amendment upon which I am addressing the Senate, though it is not before the Senate yet for action, the Chair properly advises me that I must defer asking a vote of the Senate until the bill has been improved by amendment, giving to each Senator here an opportunity to improve the text according to his own best judgment. That is the situation in which we are found. What prospect is there for a proper consideration of this vast measure?

Now, sir, I would like to have the opportunity of determining the sense of this body upon the question of a pro rata graduation or reduction of the rates of duties as they exist now, and to go to the country with that sort of legislation which could easily pass both Houses, and which I have not any doubt would meet with acceptance on the part of the entire people of the United States. They would say that our legislators are indeed in earnest in trying to reduce the amount of money received into the Treasury, but not wishing to deal unkindly with any interest or too favorably for any interest they make a horizontal graduation of the existing rates of duty. On the basis of existing law we take off 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. the first year, and a like amount the second year, and in that way evince a disposition to treat with fairness and evenness all the great industries, and the little ones too, for the relief of the consumers as well as the producers and the manufacturers. It will be felt by the people that we do not disturb commerce by an upheaval of the financial system or commercial system; that we do not engage in a revolutionary proceeding for the purpose of putting upon this country, without previous trial, our own conjecture as to what would be a safe experiment for us to make.

That would be the way in which the country would receive a measure of this kind; and, sir, this very night, if Senators would get their minds made up to accept the proposition, we can pass through the Senate a bill which will satisfy the whole of the people of the United States, at least as to the candor and integrity of our own conduct; and the Senate may as well understand that that is a portion of the case that needs some support. Our action is not going to be received, after six or eight weeks of wrangle and discordant debate in this body, as being the result simply of a wise and patriotic endeavor on our part to equalize the burdens of the tariff upon the people. Too much has been admitted, too much stands beyond the power of controversy and beyond the shadow of doubt as to the course of procedure in this Senate for us to felicitate ourselves upon the thought that we shall get before the people of the United States without some impeachment of our candor in dealing with this great subject.

But, sir, if we shall come to any line of action which must necessarily operate equally upon all, if we will agree to graduate the rates of tariff taxation by such a per cent. for this year, and such a per cent. for the next year, then the people of the United States will understand that, whether

we are wise or not, we are at all events just, and we will agree to say that which to me is a greater boon than any confidence that I could have in my own wisdom; that is, that we are faithful and honest representatives, sincere representatives of those whom we profess to represent in this Senate. I should like for the Senate of the United States to receive at least that award from the people of this country. We will receive their approbation if we deal fairly with these great questions, and give the people time to adjust their business to such changes in the tariff as we shall find it necessary to make.

I will not detain the Senate longer now upon this matter. I will yield to the Senator from Georgia, or whoever else desires the floor for the purpose of pressing his individual amendments; but I can well understand that if we get this bill in a condition where each Senator has got the right on the first opportunity of putting his own views, or attempting to put his own views, upon the structure of this bill, we shall be here not to-night only but we shall be here likely enough many days to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator from Alabama says that if any Senator here insists upon putting his individual views upon the structure of this bill of course it will fail, and yet the Senator from Alabama proposes as an amendment his own individual views against the action of the Senate for the last two months.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say that it is no pleasure to me to remain here day after day and night after night trying to have some action upon this bill; and if Senators upon the other side choose by an indefinite series of amendments and by long harangues here to defeat this bill it is, of course, in their power. I stated at the outset that that could be done. I knew it could be done. The only question is whether it will be done, or whether there is a majority of both sides of the Senate who are in favor of some revision and reduction of the tariff.

The proposition made by the Senator from Alabama is to perpetuate all the imperfections of the present tariff and to reduce indiscriminately upon articles that can not afford to be reduced, as well as upon others that might afford to be reduced much more.

I trust that there will be a united Senate in favor of the passage of some bill of this kind not only reducing internal revenue, but revising and reducing the tariff. It is of no special interest to me; I have not any interest in the matter more than any other Senator; but I think it would not be creditable to the Senate of the United States by a series of obstructions at this last moment to prevent our favorable action upon this bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I want to interrupt the Senator from Vermont to ask if he could not overcome the pleasure of making a speech and a lecture for a vote on this question? I have got tired of hearing the Senator from Vermont appeal to the Senate to take a vote when he consumes a very large portion of time himself. I am tired of the complaints that he is throwing at this side of the Chamber when he and the distinguished Senator from Ohio have been the principal obstructionists to the passage of this bill. If it had not been for the Senator from Ohio undertaking to reverse the action of the Senate in Committee of the Whole to raise the protective tariff rates on articles in which he felt a special interest this bill would have been passed before now. Republicans are the obstructionists who have prevented the earlier passage of this bill, and upon the shoulders of no two of them does more responsibility rest than on the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from Vermont. Half the time since this bill was introduced in the Senate has been consumed on that side of the Chamber. There has been no obstruction here. All that has been asked has been a fair and reasonable discussion of the various amendments here. We have staid here with you until you could not keep your own Senators here. You have scarcely got a quorum here now. They come and ask us to pair with them. You can not hold them here. And what are we to do? You control the Senate; you are the majority. Why are you complaining in us? Why do you not control your own members and keep them here?

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask if we have a majority, how it is that the other side of the House prevail on almost every division or important question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Because your propositions are so monstrous that you can not force them down the throats of your own party.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that is hardly a fair answer to my question. I have been trying to get an injustice repaired and finally succeeded in getting it partially repaired after a long struggle. There are a great many things done by the bill. If you say the Republican party have a majority here, and will let them act and frame the bill as they wish to pass it, it would be a very good bill, a bill we could stand upon.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Republican party was to be the Senator from Ohio, and he could have his way and he could pass his bill, then his judgment would approve it; but I do not know whether the judgment of other Senators on that side or of the majority of the people of this country would approve it. I do not know whether my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK] would sanction the bill which would emanate from the brain of the Senator from Ohio. I do not know whether the Senators from Iowa would approve it, the

Senators from Kansas, the Senators from California, and the Senators of other States. Why, sir, the distinguished Senator himself can scarcely bring himself to the point of voting for this bill. He would not vote for this bill unless he could get it just as he wants it. There may be other Senators who have just as much personal feeling in the matter as the Senator from Ohio. If he says that this bill must conform to his individual views, what right has he to ask other Senators to give up their individual views and preferences? None in the world.

Then you do not expect to pass the bill. That is the meaning of it. This is the very point I charged upon you nearly two weeks ago. You do not intend to pass this bill and you have not intended to pass it. You stand before the country acknowledging your inability to grapple with this great question, to pass a bill that will meet the approval and the judgment of the great mass of the American people.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With infinite pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senators on your side of the Chamber agree that we shall take a vote on this bill without further discussion?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why are you so anxious to get a vote just now? Why did you not propose it a little while ago?

Mr. ALDRICH. Or within any reasonable time that you may name?

Mr. COCKRELL. We will stay here to-night and vote upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH. We will stay here as long as you will.

Mr. COCKRELL. We will stay with you and vote at any time if you will just quit talking and go to business.

Mr. ALDRICH. The talking has been and is on that side.

Mr. COCKRELL. You have consumed more than half the time, and the RECORD shows it. I was looking around to see the obstructionists. I had forgotten my distinguished friend from Rhode Island; he comes in just after the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont as an obstructionist. I appeal to the RECORD and the country to say whether any three Senators in this Chamber have proved greater obstructionists to the passage of this bill than those three Senators.

Mr. ALDRICH. The facts will show that Senators on the other side not members of the committee—that one Senator on that side not a member of the committee has consumed more time of the Senate than the three Senators he has alluded to upon this side.

Mr. COCKRELL. The RECORD will speak.

Mr. ALDRICH. The RECORD will show that.

Mr. COCKRELL. The RECORD will settle that question.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senators on this side who have been named are all members of the committee; the Senator on that side to whom I alluded is not a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then the fact of being a member of the committee gives a Senator the exclusive privilege of being heard?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not at all; but it certainly makes it proper that he should explain.

Mr. COCKRELL. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALDRICH] is also a member of that committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. But he has not consumed quite as much time as the other Senators have. He is probably in favor of the passage of a tariff bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senators on this side are in favor of the passage of a tariff bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why have you not passed it? That is the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. Because of the obstruction and continual talk and amendments on that side of the Chamber, and that is the reason of the delay in the passage of this bill this minute.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Rhode Island knows well that if he and his *confrères* had withheld the speeches they have made there would have been nothing further to have been said on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendments now pending offered by Senators on that side of the Chamber and the declamation of Senators on that side of the Chamber are delaying the passage of this bill at this instant.

Mr. COCKRELL. How long have we been considering the amendments of the Senator from Ohio? Ever since this bill came from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate. Now forsooth because a Democrat offers an amendment you are to reprimand and lecture us for consuming the time, when your leader, your distinguished leader, the Senator from Ohio, has been here with amendment after amendment and time after time and speech after speech reversing and seeking to reverse the deliberate, mature action of the Committee of the Whole, and boldly saying to you: "Gentlemen, here, amend this bill to suit the interests of Ohio or it shall not become a law." We do not know whether it has been amended yet to suit Ohio or not. We know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has planted himself upon that platform; that unless it suits him it shall not become a law. Why are we called here, then, to waste our time without knowing whether it is going to suit the Senator from Ohio or not? If it suits him, it can become a law; if it does not, it shall not become a law, the Republican party to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, there has been no obstruction offered to the passage

of this bill from this side of the Chamber. It has been legitimate and fair discussion. We have not consumed half the time that has been consumed on this bill, and if the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Rhode Island will just possess their souls in patience and silence we can very readily and quickly dispose of this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I understand the allusion of the Senator from Rhode Island very thoroughly. Perhaps after that Senator has been in this body as long as I have he will learn that liberty of speech is one of the rights of a Senator. He has entertained this Senate with some of the most exquisite disquisitions upon the different arts of manufacturing. He was learned especially upon that *lucus à non lucendo*, the polariscope. I listened to his descriptions of it until I fancied that I could take in visions of the far future in the darkness of the sugar question while looking through the polariscope as he presented it to us. An encyclopedia could easily be made up of the knowledge and information which that Senator as a member of the Committee on Finance has been lavishing upon the people of the United States. I have never known a more sudden growth than that of the honorable Senator, and I am afraid I shall never know one that will be more likely to come to sudden grief. Jonah's gourd is no comparison to the Senator from Rhode Island in the rapidity of growth and the magnificence of his clambering, and I fear it will only be too faithful an illustration of his sudden and disastrous decadence.

Sir, he has not attempted to answer any speech or point that I have made on this floor. He has not pointed out a weak point in any argument I have made or misconception of facts I have stated. If I have discussed before this Senate too profusely upon this great measure the honorable Senator from Rhode Island, with all his close and microscopic inspection of small matters of detail, would have been able by this time to have pointed out at least some infirmity in some proposition that I have had the honor to advance; but he will live until he is gray as Noah was before he will find an infirmity in any arguments I have made here that he will be able to answer.

The Senator has been very intent here upon the cultivation of his own grounds. In the State of Rhode Island he is surrounded with the clattering looms and ringing anvils and with the paraphernalia of that system of modern slavery, where the lords and the nabobs of the land domineer over the common employés of the factory; and he comes here evidently in that sort of spirit, not content to rule within the domain of his own State, but he seeks to extend his influence over the entire length and breadth of the great agricultural communities of the United States. I happen to be a representative of that class of people who live apart, enjoy the boon of personal independence, but have no power of combination. They can not take a telegraph wire and send a message to a congress of farmers, as can be done with a congress of manufacturers, and have them to meet within a few hours of time to combine with each other and come to conclusions and send them to the Congress of the United States to be executed. The people whom I have the honor to represent are scattered over a large, wide domain. They look to God and not to Congress for prosperity. They have no way of coming together. Their collective will is not expressed at all except through the mouths of their Senators and Representatives. They are dumb unless we speak.

The Tariff Commission peregrinated through the northeastern portion of the United States, making its first stop at that *diletante* watering-place, Long Branch, and after it had absorbed enough of the influence which pervades that place of resort for all the rich and powerful men of this country to be prepared for its work, it went further along in its journey in the investigation of certain interests that were to be petted and protected. It then took a turn through the Northern States, and afterward got a little shear down toward the South. I believe a few of the commission got as far south as Atlanta, Georgia. During all that period of time there was but one agriculturist admitted before that body for the purpose of presenting the claims of the industry that he represented. That was a gentleman to whom I had the honor of referring a few days ago in some remarks that I made here and of laying his speech before the Senate—Mr. Goodwin, the enlightened farmer of Connecticut. All the balance of the great industrial laboring masses engaged in agriculture in the United States were no more heard by that commission than if they had been resting in the tomb. No attention was paid to them, no respect whatever. Their congresses did not meet, their secretaries were not present to enforce their views before the Tariff Commission, and the only chance they have had to be heard has been through the feeble efforts of their representatives on this floor and in the other House.

Sir, if the Tariff Commission had given heed to the views of the great agricultural communities of this country and had made up their minds, if they could have done such a generous thing as that, to have imposed as lightly as possible the burdens we all are laying on the shoulders of those from whom we all derive our daily bread, it would not have been incumbent upon me to rise in the Senate of the United States, as I have had the honor of doing on several occasions, and to try to present in my feeble way, on their behalf, a claim to the mercy and charity and friendly consideration of this body. We have brought no interest forward demanding protection for it; we have asked that no largess should be

charged upon the Treasury of the United States and paid to us. We have not asked for tribute or for bounty; but we come in that humble attitude in which it seems that men in this day and generation always entitle themselves to be kicked, and that is in the attitude of pleading for justice and mercy. That is all we have done, and the Senator from Rhode Island, while here as much the special advocate of particular interests in his own State as if he was the personal owner of every spindle that runs in that State, calls me to task because I undertake to present in my poor way a claim on behalf of the agricultural interests for some benevolence, some generosity, some cessation of exactions, and some small measure of justice. That is the attitude of the two Senators on this floor.

Now let the Senator prate as much as he desires about long speeches. The people of the United States will hear me when they will turn deaf ears to him, because they will know that I am not here to represent any particular industry or any particular class to seek advantage over others, and they will never believe this of him—never.

The honorable Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] has again got into a dyspeptic mood about the progress of this bill. He says that the Senator from Alabama wants to retain in the present tariff all of its infirmities and all of the evils which have been developed in this system after twenty years of experience. Father be merciful to thy child! Who is the father of the present tariff? Out of whose mind came every bone and muscle and nerve and lineament? Whose features, whose stamp, whose impress does it bear?

The honorable Senator from Vermont is the man who has been in one sense the author of every word in the tariff that exists to-day. It has passed under revision through his mind time and time again. He has shaped its every provision. He himself was the author of a measure of reduction precisely of the same character with that which I have brought to the attention of the Senate, and now he complains that I wish to antagonize my private views against those of the Senate of the United States as he says already expressed, and to thrust my opinions before this body in the advocacy of a proposition for a horizontal reduction. The Senate has come to no such conclusion. He is the father of that idea; he drew the bill that gave us the first horizontal reduction and afterward the first horizontal revision of the tariff. Shall I not copy from one so distinguished and so learned? Must he discard his own child and deny the paternity of his own measure in order to get the advantage of placing me in a position of antagonizing myself to the opinions of the Senate of the United States? Has the Senator no memory? Has every idea fled from his mind as to his own responsibility for the condition of things that exists in this country to-day? Sir, the Senator with his venerable years and great experience would do well to understand after all that there is a sweetness in doing justice to an adversary; that there is a sentiment of honor and a principle in dealing among gentlemen which should cause them to forbear to make accusation unnecessarily. He chides me with bringing a measure forward here to-night which I have copied out of his own statute. He chides me for asking a general reduction upon this subject, when the great newspaper press of this country through the length and breadth of it are now advocating that as the only feasible measure. In retort I say to the honorable Senator that no one has broken from the ranks of his committee and has done violence more frequently to the recommendations of that committee than the Senator from Vermont. There has not been one single proposition of an important character presented in this Senate during the whole length of the discussion where there was to be an increase of protection, that the Senator from Vermont has not abandoned his own bantling, that he has not dropped his own bill and voted against his committee for the increase.

The Senator has not spoken very long at any one time upon any occasion since this discussion opened, except upon the Japanese indemnity. He found time on that occasion to make an hour and a half or an hour and three-quarters speech against the bill and to utter a diatribe against the poor Japanese, which will stand in history as a monument of injustice, and he wound up that wonderful and peculiar speech by an announcement that he intended to vote for the bill. Well might he have said so, because he framed the bill. It was his language that pervaded it; it was his thought that was enacted; it was his wish that the Senate carried into execution; and even after that was done, in the midst of the earnest anxiety of the Senate to press this great tariff bill to a conclusion, he deliberately took up an hour and three-quarters of the time of the Senate to be heard in opposition to his own measure, winding up with a statement that he intended to vote for it.

The debates here will show whether this side of the Chamber have wasted any time imprudently or improvidently; the votes will show. The debates will show the examination that has been made of the questions, the thousands of questions—each a separate measure—that have arisen in the course of this remarkable investigation. They will show whether or not we have been throwing away the time of the people of the United States. We have no motive for this; we have only desired that if you pass a tariff bill it shall be a fair and a just one. That is all we ask, and we have asked that this committee should inform us upon questions about which we have not had a fair opportunity to be informed, for when this debate was opened there were not many Senators on this floor, outside of the Committee on Finance, who really under-

stood the bearings of all the important questions involved in this great measure. We have occupied no longer time than was necessary to do that; and now Senators arise on that side of the Chamber and reproach the honorable Senator from Georgia that he has some views which he desires to present, because he has some ideas that he would like to have discussed by the Senate. Nothing can be received, it appears, except that which comes from the Committee on Finance or after the committee has exhausted itself from some honorable member of the committee. Senators will learn, perhaps, after they grow older in the service of their country, that the honors and authority which the Senate of the United States bestows on its membership do not happen to result from the mere fact of their being on committees. There are other considerations that are regarded here besides those, and it is not becoming nor is it the right of any Senator because he happens to be upon a committee to take the floor and consume as much of the time of the Senate as he pleases, and then undertake to reproach gentlemen if they desire to express their opinions freely.

Mr. MORRILL. I am quite sure the Senator from Alabama would not do me any intentional injustice. He has stated that the bill for the reduction of 10 per cent. was framed by me.

Mr. MORGAN. I have so understood always. If I am incorrect about that I shall accept a correction.

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator is very much mistaken. I had left the House five or six years before those bills were reported. Those bills came from the House of Representatives.

Then again, the Senator has done me another, I am sure unintentional, injustice. He says I consumed an hour and a half or an hour and three-quarters of time here in discussing the Japanese indemnity fund. So far as that fact is concerned it is true; but I could not avoid it unless I omitted the presentation of my views, because it was a conference committee report, a privileged report to come in at any time, and while I urged the conference committee not to make the report until after we got through with the tariff bill, the Senator from Delaware announced to me that he was going away and, therefore, it must be made that day, and the Senate decided on its immediate consideration. I was quite averse to speaking then, for I was at that time suffering from a sudden cold I had taken, my throat was not quite in a condition for me to speak.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I am sure that I made no intimation that any Senator had occupied the time of the Senate improperly. Whether that time has been occupied with wisdom and with eloquence is a matter which the Senate and the country can determine for themselves. I am quite willing to leave to the Senate whether I have occupied any portion of the time of the Senate improperly. I am quite willing to leave to the future, the judgment of the American people, the judgment of the Senate, whether the Senator from Alabama or myself is correct in our ideas on the tariff question.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I have been so much edified and instructed and enlightened by the discussion of the last half hour, especially by the courteous and logical speeches of the Senators from Missouri and Alabama, that I feel qualified to vote on almost any subject. If it is not out of order, I should like to ask what the question before the Senate is? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] proposes to strike out all the tariff legislation and to insert what will now be read.

Mr. BROWN. I understood the Chair to rule a while ago that that would not be in order until the text was perfected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the only amendment pending.

Mr. BROWN. I offered an amendment when on the floor and made my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Georgia as offering any amendment, but as giving notice to the Senate of amendments that he would propose.

Mr. BROWN. I offered one and gave notice of others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order for any Senator to move to perfect the text proposed to be stricken out at any time before the vote is taken on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. By reference to the RECORD it will be seen that I did offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Neither the Chair nor the Secretary understood the Senator as offering any distinct amendment. He will please indicate the amendment he offers.

Mr. BROWN. The amendment is at page 80, commencing at line 1861, to strike out the clause:

Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 10 cents per one hundred pounds; in bulk, 6 cents per one hundred pounds.

And to insert:

Salt shall be placed on the free-list.

That was the amendment I distinctly offered. I do not desire to discuss it, because I am not vain enough to suppose that I could enlighten the Senate after a month's discussion here on any of these questions connected with the tariff. I desire a vote upon it, but not to make speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. On page 80, beginning in line 1861, it is moved to strike out:

Salt, in bags, sacks, or barrels, or other packages, 10 cents per one hundred pounds; in bulk, 6 cents per one hundred pounds.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending amendment, proposing to perfect the text of the bill moved to be stricken out by the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I understood the honorable Senator from Georgia to say in the few remarks he addressed to the Senate a while ago that his purpose was to reduce the burdens of the people with respect to everything entering into the ordinary wants of life; to increase the taxes upon those things which were consumed by those who are able to pay for luxuries. Well now, sir, it does seem to me that the reduction proposed here is confined to the commodity of salt; but I think that the honorable Senator would simplify this whole proceeding very greatly if he were just to propose again what was proposed before and voted down, to put salt upon the free-list.

Mr. BROWN. That is my proposition.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. But you intend to complicate this whole thing by a multiplicity of amendments which will lead to interminable debate, and which in my opinion will result in nothing of practical account.

Mr. BROWN. I do not ask for any interminable debate. I simply want a vote on the proposition.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. You have taken your share already.

Mr. BROWN. Not more than the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. A great deal more. The Senator includes in his amendments woolen goods, wines, brandies, and things of that sort.

Mr. BROWN. I only gave notice that I would offer those amendments. My present amendment is to strike out the language which has been read and insert in place of it that salt shall be placed on the free-list.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. That is a mere renewal of the proposition which was voted down before, but the other things are coming after a while. Does the Senator think that those articles which he has enumerated will bear a higher tax and produce any additional revenue to the Treasury? That is a reasonable question. I think the very articles that are enumerated are already taxed beyond the revenue standard.

Mr. BROWN. I will reply to the Senator that we got more than \$40,000,000 of revenue last year, and therefore I think the duties are within the revenue standard.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. It will not reach \$40,000,000 if your proposition prevails.

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes, it will—\$50,000,000.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I think those articles are taxed to the highest possible point that will bring revenue; and the Senator, under the pretext of coming in here to raise additional revenue for the Treasury to make up what it will lose on salt, will take away from the Treasury, in my opinion, money that now comes into it by the million; and then he speaks about silk and about a little champagne and a little imported brandy as though those things were not intended to be touched by anybody except gentlemen in the condition of my honorable friend. I think that there are a great many ordinary people with very moderate incomes in the Union who would like to taste a little French brandy occasionally at reasonable rates.

My honorable friend says those things are intended for the rich; the poor must not think of them. Silk and woolen cloths and good decent broadcloth nobody but the rich, he says, can touch; and hence we can afford to tax them to any extent. Now, sir, I say that is a dangerous rule to adopt. I do not think that any revenue system ought to be built upon a classification of the American people in that way. I think that when this committee that has been engaged in preparing this tariff bill thought proper to reduce the burden with respect to these articles the honorable Senator has enumerated their action ought to be permitted to stand.

I shall certainly not vote with the honorable Senator from Georgia to increase to the extent of one cent the burdens of the American people of any class, and I shall not undertake either here or elsewhere to classify them for the purposes of revenue as the honorable Senator proposes. The rights of the American people, so far as our political institutions are concerned, are the same, whether they be rich or poor; and if brandy, champagne, and silk and woolen cloths are taxed now to the full revenue limit and the wisdom of the Committee on Finance has thought proper to bring that tax down, I can not for the life of me see the consistency in the Senator proposing to raise these taxes above the limit recommended by the committee upon the ground that it is necessary to make up for what we shall lose from the tax on salt. If the poor people of this country want free salt, in God's name give it to them. I shall vote with the Senator on that, but I will not vote with him on a single proposition to raise the tax on any of the other things beyond the limit that has been prescribed by the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], which will be read: The Acting Secretary read the words proposed to be stricken out, as follows:

Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 10 cents per one hundred pounds; in bulk, 6 cents per one hundred pounds: *Provided*, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than \$100: *Provided further*, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries, and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso the duties on the same shall be remitted.

Mr. BROWN. My proposition is to strike out that language and put salt on the free-list.

Mr. CONGER. I call for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). On this subject I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM].

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WALKER (when his name was called). My colleague [Mr. GARLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. The Senator from Texas, if present, would vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. FRYE. My colleague [Mr. HALE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PENDLETON].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—24.

Beck,	Farley,	Jackson,	Vance,
Brown,	George,	Jonas,	Van Wyck,
Call,	Gorman,	Jones of Florida,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Groome,	Pugh,	Voorhees,
Coke,	Hampton,	Ransom,	Walker,
Davis of Ill.,	Harris,	Slater,	Williams.

NAYS—26.

Aldrich,	Davis of W. Va.,	Logan,	Plumb,
Allison,	Dawes,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Anthony,	Frye,	McPherson,	Sewell,
Bayard,	Harrison,	Miller of Cal.,	Sherman,
Camden,	Hawley,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor.
Cameron of Wis.,	Hoar,	Morrill,	
Conger,	Ingalls,	Platt,	

ABSENT—26.

Barrow,	Garland,	Lamar,	Pendleton,
Blair,	Grover,	Lapham,	Saulsbury,
Butler,	Hale,	McDill,	Saunders,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hill,	Mahone,	Sawyer,
Edmunds,	Johnston,	Maxey,	Windom.
Fair,	Jones of Nevada,	Mitchell,	
Ferry,	Kellogg,	Morgan,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANCE. I desire to call up the amendments to the internal-revenue bill which I offered the other day, and which are on the table of the Secretary, to come in on page 4, line 28, at the end of the section, as additional sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] will be read.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

SEC. — That the laws and regulations providing the method and machinery for the collection of internal revenue and for the appointment of storekeepers and storekeepers and gaugers are hereby declared not to apply to distilleries of spirits registered at a capacity of thirty gallons or less production per day.

SEC. — That all persons desiring to operate distilleries of thirty gallons' capacity or less per day shall obtain a license therefor annually, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall render to the district collector, upon oath, semi-annually, the amount of spirits produced for taxation, in form and manner to be likewise prescribed by said Secretary.

SEC. — That there shall be paid, for a license to distill fruit, \$25; and to distill grain or other material, on stills of not exceeding six gallons per day, \$25; exceeding six and not exceeding ten gallons per day \$50; above ten and not exceeding twenty gallons per day, \$75; and above that and not above thirty gallons, \$100; and the tax on all distilled spirits from and after the 1st January, 1884, shall be 50 cents per gallon, in addition to the license tax.

SEC. — That the salaries of collectors of internal revenue, in all districts wherein 80 per cent. of all the registered distilleries do not exceed the capacity of thirty gallons production per day, shall not be more than \$2,000 per annum; and in addition thereto they shall be paid 5 per cent. on all moneys actually collected, which shall be in lieu of all allowances for clerks, deputy collectors, and other expenses as now allowed by law or regulations.

MR. VANCE. Mr. President, a word of explanation as to these amendments, for I am not disposed to consume my own time, much less the time of the Senate, at this period of the day or rather night.

It is known to the Senate that a special committee of this body was appointed to investigate the method of collecting the internal revenue in the sixth North Carolina collection district. That committee performed the duty assigned to them, and the report of their labors is upon the desks of Senators. From that report it appears that there are more small distilleries in the State of North Carolina than in any other State in the Union; that there are over 1,400 in fact in that State, and about 800 of the 1,400 are in that one collection district; that there are only 4 or 5 which have a capacity of more than thirty gallons production per day, and that the consequence is that the country is filled with these small distilleries, the most of them being of the capacity of seven or eight gallons per day, to each one of which there is a storekeeper attached, and the land is full of storekeepers, storekeepers and gaugers, deputy collectors, special deputy collectors, and what not. In that one district there are over six hundred officers. According to the testimony which was taken by that committee, there were four hundred and twenty-seven in the year 1881, all on duty and drawing pay during the year, and quite a number who had commissions in their pockets, waiting for employment should it be practicable or should it be political policy to give it to them. The investigation showed very clearly that that army of office-holders were maintained expressly and the system of small distilleries was encouraged for political purposes, and not for the purpose of collecting revenue. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1881, there was collected in that collection district \$499,455.80, and the expenses attending that collection were \$268,324, being a little over 54 per cent., and the following exhibit is made in proof of the fact that this was a political machine.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, the expenses of the office of the collector in the collection district (including the pay of clerks, deputies, sub-deputies, and so on) amounted to \$35,037.50. There was no election that year. The next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1881, which covered the period of the elections of 1880, the expenses of the office of the collector in that district were \$44,472.28. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1882, which covered no election, those expenses sank down to \$28,250. The amount paid for gaugers and storekeepers in the year ending June 30, 1880, when there was no election on hand, was \$151,412. The amount paid to the same class of officers for the year ending June 30, 1881, which was the election year, was \$201,395. The amount paid to officers of the same class for the year ending June 30, 1882, which covered no election, sank down to \$115,567, and the same disparity is displayed in the payment of all the officers.

The testimony further discloses that these offices were disposed of by the collector, who was at the same time the chairman of the executive committee of the Republican party of that State, for political purposes and scarcely for any other purpose. It was acknowledged before the committee that the offices were given to men with a view to making political converts of them. Many hundreds—it was not possible for us to tell how many—had blank commissions in their pockets, which served the purpose that was intended when they were given to them, that there was no use for at all, and whose names do not appear on the pay-rolls, but whose names did appear prominently in political campaigns.

It also appeared that what was called blockading or illicit distilling and dealing in that country, that was so rampant a few years ago, had nearly all disappeared, and it was apparently a great improvement upon the fiscal system of the country.

The introduction of this system of dividing up the larger stills into small ones was much commended, but it turned out that the illicit distilling and dealing in spirits had only apparently ceased; the open and defiant violation of the law had ceased, but it turned out that the violators of the law had gone into partnership with the officers of the Government. It is in testimony by the opinion of the most competent men the committee could summon before it that the violators of the law were making more money and doing a better business in this guilty partnership with the Government than they did when they were moonshining in the full sense of that term. It was in proof before the committee, as will be seen by reading the report and the testimony accompanying it, that in this system of very small distilleries, some of them of only three and a half barrels of grain capacity per day, the storekeeper would divide his pay with the distiller. He would have a commission in his pocket, which would entitle him to \$3 per day for every day he was at work, and there being no distillery in operation to which he could be assigned he would propose to a neighbor, "If you will start a distillery now and let me be appointed storekeeper I will divide my pay with you," and the dollar and a half, the division of the storekeeper's pay, very nearly ran the whole concern, for it only took about from \$100 to \$150 to start one of that class of distilleries, and not more than two or three dollars per day to operate it.

It was also in proof that all conceivable frauds followed this guilty

partnership; that the storekeeper, being in the distiller's power by reason of the violation of the law by the division of the pay, was permitted to do what he pleased. If his distillery had a capacity of four bushels of grain a day he would allow the distiller to "mash in" and use as much more as he could crowd in, and in every conceivable way that was done. In many cases it was proven that there never was any grain measured or weighed for the distillery in compliance with the law; that the grain was placed in the house, the storekeeper would conveniently retire, and the distiller was allowed to help himself. It was also in proof that the custom prevailed by these accommodating storekeepers gauging up for taxation and placing in the warehouse the minimum capacity of the distillery; that is to say, two gallons of spirits to a bushel of grain, and leaving all the product over that untaxed, to be disposed of at the pleasure of the distiller.

By good distilling where the product was made to reach three gallons a day, this system would give one gallon on every bushel of grain to the distiller that paid no tax to the Government; and not only that, but by the system of fraudulent mashing in or using the grain frequently the surplus over the minimum capacity that paid no tax exceeded that which did pay the tax. One distiller in particular swore that he had a distillery assessed at forty-eight gallons capacity per week, and that he made one hundred gallons, and on fifty-two he paid no tax, and the Government got tax only on forty-eight, and that with the consent of the officer placed there and paid \$3 a day to see that the law was properly executed.

It would be impossible for me to go over all of the frauds and irregularities, to give them the mildest term, that our committee found daily in that collection district. It shows very clearly the necessity of abolishing the revenue law as to these small distilleries, and hence the proposition for an amendment to the revenue laws which I have just presented to the Senate; and that proposition is to repeal so much of the revenue law as requires the appointment of storekeepers and gaugers and persons to sit down at one of these little distilleries and watch, and provides that instead of that they shall take out a license and pay for that license in proportion to the capacity of the still and render an account upon oath of all that they distill for taxation.

It may be said that it is opening the door to fraud. The reply is that according to the testimony which was elicited by that committee the door to fraud is already wide open, and the United States revenue officer stands in the door welcoming all who see proper to enter. When you come to consider that in one year it took \$258,000 to collect \$499,000, if by imposing a license tax upon all who distill at all, and requiring them to come up and render upon oath the amount that they have distilled for taxation—if, I say, there is any possibility of committing a fraud there that would exceed the cost of collecting the revenue there, then I would agree to surrender the proposition which I have made. But they could not possibly commit a fraud that would rob the Government of as much money as is paid to useless officers for the interest and in the behalf of the Republican party of North Carolina, for that is the chief object in keeping them there. They are maintained as a regular political force, the collector being the chairman of the executive committee of the party; he has things all his own way, and that I am satisfied, from the examination of the Commissioner, Mr. Raum, is done with his full knowledge and consent.

Now, Mr. President, another consideration. Senators will find set forth in this report, if they will take the trouble to read it, evidence showing that it is a political machine. This will be found in the manner in which political contributions were levied in that county. Every officer was required to give one month's salary; that is, if he was on duty. If he was on duty continuously for the year, that would be one-twelfth of his salary; but many of them were on duty only two or three months during the year, or four and five and six months during the year, and sometimes the contributions amounted to 50 per cent. of all the officer received from the Government. Not only were circular letters sent out requesting these voluntary contributions, but frequently the collector sent his deputies for it at the same time. Often the chairman of the executive committee would send around one of his deputies with blank checks, the pay of the officer being reserved at this collector's office; he would send around deputies with blank checks and require them to sign those checks in blank, and the money was held back until the checks were signed, checks upon the bank for their salary, and they were required to sign them in blank.

How can that kind of conduct escape the implication that it is a forced contribution? Think of it. The collector sends out his deputies with the blank checks in hand and requires the officers to sign them. The money is reserved in the collector's hands, at the same time that collector being the chairman of the executive committee. Of course the money comes, and it is called a voluntary contribution! I believe every one of them swore that they willingly contributed with one exception.

Those officers are thus appointed, and the commissions are given to them for the purpose of levying contributions upon them for campaign purposes, and in some instances men were employed to edit newspapers and they were paid as Government officers, as will be seen by reference to the testimony of the collector himself. I asked him distinctly about a certain paper, substantially as follows: "Who owns the paper called the Asheville Pioneer?" "I do," said he, "with some two or three

other officers." "Who edits it?" "Mr. C. W. Eves edits it." "How did you pay him for editing it?" "I made him a general storekeeper." And orators were imported into the district and paid in the same way, tramping up and down the country, and I traced up one of them and sent for his record in the office to show what work he had done. It read something like this: On 19th policed from Statesville to Charlotte; 20th and 21st, policing in and around Charlotte; 22d, policing from Charlotte to Concord; 23d and 24th, policing around Concord. And so on all over the district. "Policing," and then by obtaining the copy of the Republican newspaper you would find that at every one of those places where he was policing he had an appointment to make campaign speeches to rally the faithful to support the party, and was paid for it out of the Treasury of the United States; policing in behalf of Republicanism, paid for it out of the Treasury of the United States. The revenue agent who was sent to investigate that matter reported that the records showed he had done no service. And so it goes on, a system of corruption, on a small scale, it is true, but the most infamous and defiant system that ever was perpetrated in this country; and that is to be sustained by the people of the United States; that is to be paid for by the people of the United States!

Sir, I want to see this system broken up. The people of North Carolina have no objection to paying that tax or any other tax laid upon them if it be necessary to support the Government; but they do not want their land filled with tramping emissaries of a political party, using the power of the Government and prostituting their offices for the purpose of controlling the political opinions of the citizens.

If this amendment shall be adopted as a part of the internal-revenue law of this country in my opinion there would result from it more clear money to the Treasury than is now collected. It is not possible that these men could commit more fraud against the Government than they are now committing, and the expenses of this vast army of officers is much greater in my opinion than the amount that these small distillers could defraud the Government of if the license for the still was properly assessed according to the capacity.

I will not, as I said when I started out, detain the Senate; it is too late an hour to do that and do justice to this subject; but I have felt it my duty to call up these amendments and ask for a vote upon them before the bill finally passes from this jurisdiction.

I want simply to say that I have collated the expenses of similar districts in the southern portions of the United States, in the States of South Carolina and Georgia and Tennessee, situated somewhat like the sixth district of North Carolina. I find in the second Georgia district that the collections were \$266,000 and a fraction, and the expenses of collection \$76,000, which I make about 30 per cent.; in the second Tennessee district the collections were \$110,000 and the expenses of collecting over \$29,000, which I make about 33 per cent.; in the eighth Kentucky district the collections were \$216,681 and the expenses of collection were \$49,000, which is about 25 per cent.; in the South Carolina collection district I find the amount collected was \$135,907 and the expense of collecting was \$45,332, and so on.

The amendment which I offer does not propose to disturb the internal-revenue laws in the slightest degree except as to these small distilleries of less than thirty gallons capacity. I think that purity in politics would be promoted, I think that revenue would be promoted, and good order would be promoted, and the harmony and satisfaction of the people in all those sections of the country by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. McDILL. Mr. President, as I was a member of the committee to which the honorable Senator from North Carolina has referred, it may be necessary for me in behalf of the majority of that committee to enter a dissent to some of the propositions made by the honorable Senator from North Carolina, without reference to the merits of the amendment he has proposed.

I understand him to charge that the evidence as taken before the committee shows that the offices of the revenue collector in the sixth district of North Carolina were used largely for political purposes. On the contrary, I think the evidence shows directly the opposite of that. It was undoubtedly true that the evidence showed that the collector in appointing his subordinates appointed them mainly from his own political party, but it was equally true that the evidence showed beyond any question that he often appointed men from the opposite political party. That is shown by the testimony of the collector himself as well as by the testimony of witnesses who were brought before the committee and who had been in the employ of the Revenue Department, and who stated that they were and had been Democrats and had never changed their politics.

Then, so far as the appointing was concerned, it was not confined at all to the Republican party, but appointments were made from both parties, and the collector states in a very intelligent way why he did so, and that brings out the real reason why politics had some connection with the administration of the collection of internal revenue in that district. He states, and so does Commissioner Raum, that when he was called upon some years ago, about 1872 I think, to take charge of that district he found it in a deplorable condition. It is a mountain district, composed of thirty-four counties, in the western part of North Carolina. There were no good roads; many of the roads were mere

bridle-paths; every mountain, every ravine, every place almost was occupied by those who were known as blockaders or distillers of illicit whisky. At that time life was in danger.

The collectors of revenue and their subordinates were often in danger as they passed from place to place. They frequently were unable to obtain a meal's victuals because the prejudices of the people were so great against the system, and why? It was because when they returned from the war they found this new system of collecting taxes. Before that time for generations they had been in the habit of establishing little stills and making up their corn and their fruit into liquor. They had never been used to a heavy tax upon liquors, and coming as they did from the war, coming back to their homes and finding all things in a ruinous condition, being a very illiterate kind of people, those engaged in this mountain whisky-making were led to believe and often do believe, as I think the evidence shows, that this was some special system of torture that had been invented by the Yankees and that they were being put upon; that they had not merely been conquered, that they had not merely been driven out of their camps and compelled to go back to their fields, but that they were being in some way put upon by the Government.

It was not long until those who were engaged in political discussions took advantage of this feeling and kindled the flame and made it burn higher instead of cooling it. All sorts of opprobrious epithets were applied by those who represented the opposite political party to all who were connected with the revenue service. They were called, it was said, grasshoppers. Although it was not in testimony, yet it was stated to me as a matter of fact in that State that one eminent politician obtained from the West one of the grasshoppers which sometimes depredate our fields, and embalming it in alcohol carried it about with him from stump to stump and illustrated what he called the wickedness and robbery and tyranny of the revenue officers by a lecture upon the devastation which visited the Western States through the grasshoppers. In this way these unfortunate people were raised up to a feeling that the war was not over so far as they were concerned and that all these taxes on whisky were so many devices of their natural enemies intended to torture them. These people were white people, many of them ignorant people, who were unacquainted with the course of public affairs.

Mr. DAWES. They had not caught on.

Mr. McDILL. They had not caught on. About the time that Dr. Mott, who was the late collector of internal revenue of that district, was appointed, or shortly after that time, the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue tried some way of breaking up this illicit distilling in the South, and I know of no better way of stating his plans and his mode than by reading a few sentences from his testimony, all of which any Senator who desires to understand the question should read carefully.

Have you any idea of the extent of country it covers?

He was asked as to the district.

Answer. Well, it constitutes not quite one-half in territory and almost one-half in length of the State of North Carolina.

Q. Nearly three hundred miles?

A. It must be very nearly three hundred miles. The policy of my predecessor did not seem to be to establish a permanent system of repression, and suitable means had not been provided to overcome the formidable resistance which had grown up in that and other districts. After looking into the matter carefully, I became satisfied that the only way to suppress frauds there was to array against the wrongdoers a force which would be sufficient to overcome their resistance, and I directed in various communications the collector to employ the necessary force to overcome this resistance. I stationed in that district the most experienced and courageous revenue agents to assist by co-operating with the collector in the enforcement of the laws. It was found that there were so many persons engaged in defrauding the government that to bring everybody to punishment who was guilty would involve so large a portion of the population that it would be quite impracticable.

After consultation with the collector, whom I found to be a man of good judgment, a fixed policy was adopted of dealing with these offenders, and it was not confined to that district, but was made a general system in all the infected districts. The plan was, first, by vigorous measures, to force violators of the law to the wall, so to speak, and then, after they had become satisfied of the determination of the Government and its ability to enforce the laws, and had manifested a disposition to make peace with the Government, to extend to them leniency, on such conditions as should appeal to the best side of their nature, so as to induce them to cease committing frauds and resisting the officers, and to observe the laws and assist in establishing a public sentiment favorable to their enforcement. In all this work, which was a work of time, for you can not revolutionize a public sentiment so well settled as that in a day—it takes years of patient labor—I found Collector Mott not only earnestly devoted to the work, but an exceedingly energetic man, and possessing all the necessary qualifications of mind and will to carry out the instructions that were given him.

The suppression of illicit distilling, as I have said, was not confined to that district, but it was a general system, and at times armed forces were organized, extending from Wheeling, West Virginia, almost to the Gulf of Mexico, moving simultaneously, and co-operating for a month or two at a time for the suppression of these frauds. One serious difficulty was the insufficiency of the appropriations. The operations of the Government were spasmodic, not continuous, for the want of money. After the spirit of the illicit distillers had been pretty well broken, I inaugurated a system of encouraging the establishing of small legal distilleries in all the illicit-distilling districts, believing that the people who were in the habit of making distilled spirits would either make them lawfully or unlawfully, and I thought it was better to authorize small licensed distilleries, even though the Government should get only five or ten dollars a day from them, rather than to have continual turmoil and confusion in trying to suppress illicit distillation. That system originated in my office, and letters were written to Collector Mott, among others, to enter upon the work of encouraging the old distillers to establish lawful distilleries.

Here is the origin of what is known as the small distilling system, and I do not think that my honorable friend from North Carolina or

any Senator upon the floor would be able to think of a better plan for breaking up the illicit distillation than the plan that was adopted. What in fact was the result? From that being a district in which the revenue officers were in danger wherever they traveled from point to point, and were compelled to take their provisions with them because they could not have the hospitality of the country, in the years that have passed since the adoption of that system all has been changed. It is not known now that there is in all that district a single illicit distillery. It was evident everywhere the committee went, for we not only took testimony here but in North Carolina, in the very district which was being investigated; and the testimony came not only from the political friends of the collector but from his political enemies, that there is a better state of sentiment in that country than there was a while ago. Revenue officers can now travel with safety; revenue officers can now receive the hospitality of those with whom they wish to stop over night or for a meal. There is a better state of feeling.

But it became necessary for those who were making a political attack against this system to change their base, and from arraigning the revenue officers as those who were attempting to destroy the honest business of these people they changed their policy, and for some years they have been charging that this was a political machine, just as the honorable Senator from North Carolina has charged to-night that this collector's office and all the paraphernalia of the office were a huge Republican political machine. That was met, after consultation, by the appointment of Democratic young men to these places, the object being, as Dr. Mott, I think, expressed it, to divide the odium of the revenue system between the Democrats and the Republicans. He selected as well as he could young men of good character and of good families, so that they naturally became the defenders of the system. They saw then, for the first time probably, the injustice of the charges that were made against this system and these officers, and gradually some of them moved over toward the line of the opposite party, until some of them became good Republicans. Others remained Democrats and are Democrats to-day, but they testify with reference to the doings of the revenue system in a spirit of fairness.

It may be that it costs a great deal of money to have these small distilleries; so it costs a great deal of money I am told to officer some of the custom-houses on the border, which are necessary, however, to put a stop to smuggling. The difficulty comes from the habits of the people. These people are in the habit of having small distilleries. There is a real necessity, if they make whisky at all, that they should make it in that way. They are not able to have larger distilleries; they are not blessed with the means of transportation that we have in the Northern States, and it is almost a necessity for them to condense their products in some way, and they have chosen to condense their corn and their fruit into whisky and brandy. As long as that state of affairs exists there this or some better system must be adopted. This system is a tried one.

My friend says there was an abundance of evidence of a division of pay. True, there is evidence the charge was made. We heard by way of rumor all over the State of North Carolina and we heard from witnesses here rumors that storekeepers were dividing their pay with distillers. I have not time, and it would not be fair to weary the Senate by going fully into the testimony, but I wish to refer now to the testimony of some of these witnesses to show the character of it. The first witness sworn was J. C. Barkley, page 16:

Heard one storekeeper say that he had to divide. Knows nothing of personal knowledge. Heard Mr. Freeze, a distiller, say that Storekeeper Summers had agreed to divide with him. Heard one storekeeper say that he expected no assignment because he would not divide, and another that he would not divide, but would pay liberally for board.

That is the character of the testimony almost without exception.

Mr. A. H. Brooks, an internal-revenue agent who was sent down there to investigate this charge, it having come to the ears of the Commissioner that storekeepers were dividing, testified that he would not accede to distillers' terms:

Learned of one case where distiller refused to run because the storekeeper would not agree to his terms for board. Witness reported case to Mott, who said the distiller should not have the man he wanted if he never run. Witness and Dr. Mott tried to find a case of division, but was never able to prove one.

The Commissioner in his testimony said that he had thought a great deal about the matter; he had heard the rumors; he had some reason to believe that in some cases the storekeepers did divide their pay with distillers, and that he had set the machinery of the office here at work to try to find such a case. The character of the statements was largely of that same kind, and came, I have no doubt, from the political discussions and the political charges that were made.

My friend says that there was some one who was an officer who went about making speeches, and he charges broadly that he was paid out of the United States Treasury for making speeches. I heard when I was in North Carolina that the honorable Senator made last year eighty-odd speeches in the State of North Carolina. I suppose he drew his pay as a United States Senator at the time; but could I charge with any degree of candor or with any degree of reason that my honorable friend was paid out of the United States Treasury to make the political speeches that he made? I could not do it. I think the evidence is that this man was paid for the time he worked for the Government.

With regard to political assessments I want to say that it was in evidence that political assessments were raised there as they have been raised in every part of this country. It is a matter of public notoriety that they have been raised in that way. These young men down there paid large sums of money, sometimes giving over for political purposes as much as one month's salary; but I believe with one single exception—and that was denied—all claim that they did it voluntarily and were glad to do it and willing to pay. I know it may be said that that amounts to but little. Men will say that on any occasion, but that seems to be the testimony in the case.

I want to call attention to the statement of Dr. Mott as to the manner of collecting. He was being asked about the contributions for campaign purposes, and he says:

Question. Did you undertake to force your subordinates to pay it?

Answer. Not at all.

Q. Did you write a circular letter to your subordinates to pay it?

A. I wrote a letter to the subordinates, and expressed myself to every one of them saying, I think—that is my recollection of it—that they were not required to pay; that the committee did not want it unless it was paid willingly. I wanted them to understand that, and so expressed it in the letter, and that if they did not accede to it that in no sense would their standing be interfered with by their refusal, either at my office or at the Department.

Q. So you left it entirely optional with them to pay it or not?

A. Yes, sir. I want to state further in connection with these assessments in this State and the amount that was raised, that the amount that had been expended in North Carolina generally to make a campaign there, under the disadvantages the Republicans have to contend with in that State—that the amount necessary for those purposes was about \$25,000. It takes about that to make an ordinary campaign, in the way that it had been conducted in that State; and in making these assessments I was governed by the amount that I thought necessary to make that campaign.

I suppose it is too late in the day for any one either on this side or the other to defend the raising of money in that way. I am ready to say, however, that the conduct of affairs in reference to political assessments, as far as I understand the case and as far as the evidence developed it, was no other and no different from what has prevailed in all parts of this country for years past, even in the good old Democratic days when I am told it was customary to check off the rolls beforehand, and at the very place where the disbursing officer paid the clerks a man was standing by to keep out the amount assessed against them. It was wrong then; it is probably wrong yet; but in this particular there was nothing peculiar in this district.

Now, with reference to the amendment itself, I am free to say that it does look to me to be a pity that it should be necessary to spend such a large sum of money to collect the revenue, and yet I can see that there was a real necessity for this or some other plan, and this seemed to be the best plan at the time. It seemed to work well. Whether or not the change proposed by the honorable Senator from North Carolina can now properly be adopted, I am unable to say. I can see that in that country, situated as it is, being a mountain country, unless there was a constant delay and hourly supervision of these small distilleries, there would be many doors wide open for fraud. It is possible that the plan proposed by the honorable Senator, if it was fully elaborated and carefully studied, might be a better plan than the one adopted by the Department, but I think it ought to be after study on the part of the Finance Committee, after investigation. I think it would be unsafe and unwise to attempt, as an amendment upon this bill, to change the plan of collection, especially when we have a plan which has succeeded in collecting the revenue. It is in testimony that under this system 1,160 illicit distilleries have been broken up during the time Dr. Mott was collector. So that the work done under this system has been efficient in accomplishing this purpose, it has worked well, and we ought to be cautious in changing the system.

My friend also proposes to reduce the tax. I am not in favor of that. I think the tax ought not to be reduced. I would not have taken any part in this discussion but for the fact that it seemed to me necessary at least to present this case in a little different view from that in which my friend from North Carolina presented it. He seemed to me to dwell too much on the testimony taken for the defense, if I may use that term, and overlooked the testimony taken on the other side. The testimony taken by the committee is voluminous; it is general rumor. We were compelled to hear what was said by way of rumor in order that we might possibly find a man who knew the alleged facts. But I undertake to say that not in one case in ten thousand did we ever get past rumor. It seemed to be a circular motion, and I think it generally came from political speeches made by some orators during the campaign. There was a great deal of cloud and no rain, as my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MITCHELL] suggests. He was a worthy coadjutor in the work we undertook to do down there, and I hope he will give his views on the subject.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President—

Mr. VANCE. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will allow me to make a reply.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. This does not seem to be a fair discussion. If the Senator wants to reply I shall certainly not prevent it, and I will give way of course if he will give me the floor after a while. I do not want to occupy more than two or three minutes.

Mr. VANCE. My friend from Iowa thinks that we got no proof, that it was all rumor we got when we were in North Carolina investigating the sixth collection district. Doubtless when his recollection goes back

over the testimony he will modify that statement. When we put men on the stand who confessed that they had done these things it seems to me that that would amount to proof, especially in the absence of anything to the contrary.

We put quite a number of men on the stand who confessed that they had divided their pay with the distillers or rather quite a number of the distillers on the stand who confessed that they did receive pay from the storekeepers. We put quite a number of practical distillers on the stand who swore that they had made more whisky that was not taxed than was taxed; who swore that the storekeepers stood by and never made them measure or weigh the grain as the law requires; and they said that the storekeeper would gauge up his two gallons that the Government required and let them take the balance. We also proved by men that false keys were made and that the distillers were in the habit of carrying false keys and entering the warehouses and removing whisky surreptitiously. All these things were proven by parties who state that they did it or saw it done. If that does not amount to proof, I confess I do not know what proof is. Of course there was a good deal of rumor, because that kind of investigation had to take rumor in order to put us upon the track of the evidence. It was a general inquiry, a grand inquest into the spirituous affairs of that collection district.

In relation to this man Harris, the Senator from Iowa says certainly I can not be accused of taking money out of the Treasury of the United States for making political speeches while a Senator. I think that is hardly a fair parallel to the case before us. This man did not live in the district. He was a colored man and a noted orator among the colored people. He was sent for and brought into the district pending the Presidential campaign in 1880, and was on campaign duty for a large portion of the time, and he received pay, as the vouchers that were on file which were produced before the committee show, and that he did no work. I beg to show by reading from the testimony of the revenue agent who was sent to investigate:

UNITED STATES INTERNAL REVENUE.
Greensborough, N. C., February 6, 1881.

SIR: In reply to office letter of 20th January, 1881 ("T. M. C." & "L. S. R."), directing me to find out to what particular duty James H. Harris, special deputy in the sixth district of North Carolina, at \$125 per month, is assigned, and to report upon his character, qualifications for the service, and the work performed by him during the time he has been under commission, I have the honor to state that an investigation of the case shows that the duty to which Mr. Harris is assigned is to circulate around among the colored people and gather what information he can as to parties engaged in illegal traffic in spirits and tobacco in that district.

As to his character, I am hardly competent to judge from my own knowledge, having met him only once, but from what information I have been able to gather, I should consider it reputable.

As to his qualification for that service, I see no reason why he is not qualified, but I think very little can be accomplished in that way. My experience has been that very little can be accomplished by this method. It soon comes to be understood or suspected what such a person's business is, and very little information will be imparted.

In the case of Mr. Harris, I find that the colored people generally understand his business, and they will give him no information.

As to the work performed by him, there is no record in the collector's office showing that he has accomplished anything during the seven months he has been on this duty.

I learn that much of his time has been spent out of his district.

I consider him of no use to the service in his present capacity.

Very respectfully,

HORACE KELLOGG,
Revenue Agent.

Hon. GREEN B. RAUM,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

That does not appear to be rumor. That is the report of the revenue agent who was sent there to examine, and he says he finds no record of his having done anything; but the newspapers of the day show that he had a splendid record in rallying the colored people to the support of the Republican ticket in 1880. I have no objection to that in the world, but I state that his valuable services ought to have been paid for out of the pockets of the faithful, and not out of the Treasury of the United States.

Now I want to read a little more from the testimony taken in reference to the appointment of men with a view to proselyting. Here is the testimony of the collector himself when he was upon the stand, the question being put by the chairman:

Question. Has not your office been administered, in part, with a view of making converts from political opponents? I mean by that—if you do not understand me—have you not picked up young men of large family connections and got them into positions in the departments with the expectation that they would become Republicans and bring their friends with them?

Now, here is his answer:

I would say, in reply, that I had two purposes in selecting men for these places. One was, as I stated this morning, to transfer as much as possible the odium that was put upon the service there in that State to the Democratic party; and appointments were made there among the Democrats against the wish of my political friends, and with that view. I know I was threatened at one time with a move against me on account of that. I escaped at the time by defending myself in my conversation with my political associates that it would result in the way that you see it has. That is one defense of my course, and I confess that I have selected men with that view to some extent.

There is the open acknowledgment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That means virtually that he was getting Democrats to obey the law and then they would become Republicans.

Mr. VANCE. Perhaps he did mean that, and perhaps he did not. Now, let us see if that is the case that he was trying to get men to obey

the law. The charge made against the collector by Revenue Agent Crane, on which he was discharged from office soon after his appointment, was as follows:

7. Mott has received credit on his disbursing accounts for \$900 paid W. P. Drake for services as deputy collector for the last quarter of 1872 and the first quarter of 1873. Drake never rendered any service as deputy collector.

That is the charge made by the revenue agent, Crane. Here is the answer to it by the collector, Mott:

Mr. Drake, one of the publishers of the only Republican journal in this district, was appointed a deputy in good faith, but did very little service as such, for the reason—

I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa especially to this—for the reason that shortly after his appointment the main printer in the newspaper office became disabled. Printers are scarce in this section, and the Presidential campaign being on hand all such were tightly engaged. Consequently, Mr. Drake renewed his operations at the newspaper office, while his work as deputy was faithfully and efficiently discharged by others employed for the purpose.

Mr. McDILL. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the testimony on that point?

Mr. VANCE. Certainly.

Mr. McDILL. He will find on page 369:

Question. Mr. Drake was a general storekeeper residing in Statesville?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Which Mr. Drake was it?

A. E. B. Drake.

Q. What aged man is he?

A. Mr. Drake is now 68 years old, I think near 70.

Mr. VANCE. That is the father of the man I am reading about. That is the old gentleman who was general storekeeper. This is the young man, W. P. Drake, who was a special deputy.

Mr. McDILL. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. VANCE. From page 511, from the answer of Mott to charges made by Crane. Now, in the case of Eves, to which I referred—

Mr. McDILL. I have now found the place I want to call the Senator's attention to—the answer to the seventh charge which he was reading.

After stating "that shortly after his appointment, the main printer in the newspaper office became disabled," he says:

Printers are scarce in this section, and the Presidential campaign being on hand, all such were tightly engaged. Consequently, Mr. Drake renewed his operations at the newspaper office, while his work of deputy was faithfully and efficiently discharged by others employed for the purpose.

Mr. VANCE. Certainly, but Mr. Drake was paid while other people did the work. That is what I complain of. Others were paid for doing the work.

Mr. LOGAN. Drake paid the others?

Mr. VANCE. No; there is no statement of that kind. While his work as deputy was faithfully and efficiently discharged by others employed for that purpose, there is no evidence whatever that Mr. Drake paid them. Let us see if anybody paid for the work done by Mr. Eves, at page 408. If my friend from Iowa sees proper to keep up with me, he will find what I am going to read:

Question. Who joined with you in the purchase of the "Pioneer"?

Answer. I think Mr. Bryson was one; A. B. Gillespie, and Mr. Brown.

Q. Was Mr. Lusk?

A. Yes, sir; Mr. Lusk was in, too.

Q. Whom did you get to edit it?

A. Mr. Eves.

Q. C. W. Eves?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you pay him for his service as editor?

A. Eves was at that time a general storekeeper, and he probably acted as deputy too.

Q. Did he have much work to do?

A. I do not remember. There is not much work on that side of the mountains. You have some knowledge of it. There are not many distilleries over there; but we are compelled to keep an officer there.

That is the way he was paid, and so it runs through the whole of this testimony. I suppose it will not be denied by anyone conversant with the affairs down there that the whole thing was a political machine, and the collector was at the same time runner and organ-grinder and handle-turner of the machine.

There were some irregularities discovered of a very serious character in the office in the earlier years of the administration, to wit, the forging of vouchers, the putting in of the names of men as having done service, accompanied by vouchers purporting to be sworn to and signed by the collector, and all that, for the purpose of obtaining credit on the disbursing account of the collector in the office in this city. The collector answered to that, admitting that these things had been done, and said they were done without his knowledge. When asked why he did not know of these things, they having been done in his own office by his own chief clerk, his answer was that he was absent in the campaign. There is the secret of the whole thing. He was absent in the campaign serving his party, and not serving the Government in the office to which he had been appointed and for which he was receiving pay.

I will not go further into these irregularities, the false and forged vouchers that were exhibited before the committee. They will all be found in the testimony submitted with the report of the committee. But I have to say in conclusion once more that it seems to me no candid and dispassionate man can thoroughly read and study this testimony

but will be convinced that it is a machine of a political party, a political branch to the revenue department of this Government that is not creditable to be maintained openly at the expense of the public, and that it would result not only to the credit of the country to abolish it, but it would result to the actual benefit of the Treasury to abolish all this machinery as applied to these small distilleries throughout the mountain region of the South.

Mr. McDILL. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for a moment longer on this subject—

Mr. VANCE. If the Senator will allow me, I desire to modify my amendment, wherein it provides that the tax upon whisky shall be reduced to 50 cents a gallon; not that I would not have it that, but I am satisfied that from the vote taken two or three days ago the sense of the Senate is decidedly against a reduction. Therefore I modify it so as not to change the existing tax upon whisky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is so modified.

Mr. McDILL. I think it is only fair that I should refer to one matter spoken of by the Senator from North Carolina, and that is that part of his remarks in which he speaks of irregularities and then of forged vouchers. Let me state briefly the facts concerning that case. It was a matter which occurred within a very few months of the appointment of the collector, who afterward served as I recollect about eight years. He entered upon the discharge of his duties in that mountain district which I described in my former remarks entirely unacquainted with the routine work of the revenue office. At that time the system of supervisors of internal revenue was still in vogue and Mr. Perry was the supervisor of that district. Mr. Perry suggested to Dr. Mott the employment of one J. A. Clarke, with whom Mr. Perry had had acquaintance, and with whom, as I recollect the testimony, Dr. Mott had none, saying he was an efficient man and understood the routine work of the office, and he could trust him to set things going in the proper way.

At that time allowances were made of so much per annum for the employment of officers, and the collectors of internal revenue were allowed to employ as many or as few as they chose; they could only take from the Treasury the amount that was allowed them for that fiscal year. Mr. Clark took charge. He says in the district from which he came it was the custom to fill up in an informal way vouchers, and they often filled them up for a much larger amount than the allowance for the year with the intention of affecting the allowance for the coming year; that is to say, if the estimate had been made for three deputies at \$100, they would make up vouchers for five deputies at \$125 that they might thereby impress on the mind of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the necessity of making a larger allowance for the coming year.

A man named Kestler served a portion of a month and \$65 was paid to him, but it seems the collector did not know that Kestler had been discharged. Mr. Mott, as the Senator suggests, was absent, let it be on campaign duty; he was absent from the office, and trusting at the time to what this man Clark should do, Clark filled out the voucher, attached Kestler's name to it and signed it, but the money was not paid to Kestler, but was paid to a man of the name of Walker. The evidence is clear and explicit that not one single dollar of money did Dr. Mott draw from the Treasury improperly; on the contrary that it was utterly impossible for him to so draw a dollar of money from the Treasury, because the allowance was made for the fiscal year, and over and above that amount it was impossible for him to draw. The charges were made against him at once when the matter was discovered, and it was discovered about the time that it occurred. Dr. Mott was summarily removed as soon as the charges were made. An investigation was had by the Internal Revenue Department and Dr. Mott was restored, and remained in that office eight years. He was vindicated by the men who investigated the transaction.

A large part of what the honorable Senator from North Carolina reads is from the reports of the revenue agents. All who know the working of the Revenue Department well know that they are sent about in the shape of detectives, but it is sometimes the case that they magnify their office. I think sometimes they are impressed with the idea that unless they tell something wonderful of what they have seen or smelt the Department will not regard them as efficient detectives. Almost every one of these things has been investigated; and if Senators will examine the testimony of the commissioner, Mr. Raum, they will find that the conduct of that office from first to last was regarded as proper and regular.

Mr. VANCE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him if there is any proof of a reinvestigation of the case of Mr. Mott when he was first turned out?

Mr. McDILL. I think there is not. The proof stands this way: that he was removed as soon as the charge was made. Then a letter of Dr. Mott, explaining the charge, was given in evidence, and it appears he was put back in the place, and served for nearly eight years after that time.

Mr. VANCE. Is it not in proof also that he was restored by the President over the protest of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury both?

Mr. McDILL. I do not know but that may be true. It was not the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, however.

Mr. VANCE. One more question, and then I will give the floor to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. The Senator from Iowa says that there was no money obtained upon these false and forged vouchers. Suppose the money, as it was, was placed in the hands of the collector on the estimate made for the official expenses of the year, and suppose vouchers were sent out which were false and forged to account for the expenditure of that money already in his hands, I ask if that is not the same thing as drawing money out of the Treasury directly upon those false and forged vouchers?

Mr. McDILL. No, sir; that was not the case. It was expected when this allowance was made to the collector that he should himself take care of all subordinates, and they got their pay from him or none at all.

Mr. VANCE. Of course the collector was not expected to keep all the money that was over. He was not expected to retain that; but the funds were given to him to expend in the proper expenses of his office upon condition that proper vouchers should be filed. Of course if all the money given to him for office expenses was not expended the balance belonged to the Treasury, and if sending up the name of a man as having served nine months who had not served at all, and only had pretended to serve for twenty-one days, and getting credit upon the disbursing account in this city in the Commissioner's office for that much money expended of the amount in his hands, if that was not an improper expenditure of money I do not know what could be.

Mr. McDILL. But the evidence shows that every dollar of that money was not paid to Kestler, but was paid to Mr. Walker.

Mr. VANCE. That was the evidence, I admit, but it was not the evidence at the time.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I certainly should not engage in the discussion between these Senators, but I desire to call the attention of the Senate for a moment to what was said here to-night. At this late hour of the day and with but few days remaining of this session, we were told to-night that there was no disposition to prevent the passage of this bill or action being taken upon it, and within one hour after the criticisms fell from the lips of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] applicable to this side of the Chamber we have conducted pertinent to this bill, of a very significant character. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] introduced a proposition here to change the whole system of collecting the internal revenue of this Government, a proposition calculated to provoke discussion, and a proposition that can perform no office in connection with this bill except that of delay. I will not say that it was introduced for that purpose, but I do say that is the only office it can perform. Instead of discussing the amendment on its merits as to whether this would be a better plan than the present system for the collection of the internal-revenue tax on distilled spirits, we are to listen here to a speech in reference to the conduct of men who were officers and who are now citizens and out of office. We are to listen to detailed accounts of political speeches and matters wholly disconnected with the question so far as the collection of the revenue is concerned.

Now, sir, what is the proposition? It is to provide that distillers who distill thirty gallons or less per day shall not be required to have vigilance over them by the officers of the Government, but that they shall be permitted to distill spirits by obtaining a license from the Government. I wish to call the attention of the Senator who proposed this amendment to one or two of his own propositions: First, he objects to the mode and manner of collecting the revenue. Why? Because corrupt men were appointed, he says, in a certain district, but who no longer hold office. Corrupt men have been appointed in office at times since the world began, and the best laws that have ever been enacted have sometimes had corrupt and bad men to enforce them. That is no argument against the law. It is only an argument against the men who were appointed under the law.

The Senator says that some of them were Democrats. If they turn out to be dishonest on account of being Democrats, I have naught to say. If they were more honest because they were Democrats, the better for the Government; but that is no argument. I will answer the Senator's proposition in this way: The time has not long passed when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had to ask for the power of this Government to be exercised to enforce the laws in the State of North Carolina, in the State of Tennessee, in Georgia, and in other States of the South, in order to collect the revenues of the Government. People there were determined not to pay the taxes on distilled spirits due to the Government, and they were denominated and known as "moonshiners" in the land. One thousand men in one locality in one week pleaded guilty in a Southern State to having violated the revenue laws. Men were convicted and sent to the penitentiary for violations of the law. Men were murdered and driven out of the States because they were revenue officers. But those men learned finally that they must obey the law. To-day the revenues are collected all over the country fairly, and I believe honestly, and at the very moment when we come down to a point when the revenues can be collected in his State the Senator desires a law to be passed that will give opportunity to every character of fraud that can be invented by the genius of man.

The Senator says we should collect more revenue by allowing these distillers to make an affidavit as to how much they have distilled.

First, he says he proposes to wipe out the machinery of the internal-revenue laws and substitute a new machinery, which is that the distiller shall make an affidavit as to how much spirits he has distilled during the day, the month, or the year, and that statement shall be taken and the revenues collected on that. In the next breath he says that those same distillers testified before a committee that they distilled more whisky than they did not pay the tax on than they did pay the tax on. Yet you are asked to take their affidavit as to the amount of whisky they distill.

Mr. VANCE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. VANCE. The Senator perhaps did not understand me. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I speak of a distiller sometimes as the man who owns the distillery, and then of the distiller as the practical man who operates it. The practical workmen who operate the distillery were the men who said they did do this thing.

Mr. LOGAN. It makes no difference whether the man who owned the still or the man who operated it for him cheated the Government; it was all the same; the Government was cheated and the owner got the profit and the Government was defrauded. Now, the Senator, who desires to have everything done honestly, judiciously, and properly, and in good order, comes here and asks the Congress of the United States to take the affidavit of these thieves who cheated the Government, according to his own statement, rather than to have an officer of the Government stand there and watch them. That is the argument of the Senator. That is the honesty that is to be ascertained and to be found in the execution of the law that he proposes.

Allow me to demonstrate here in one moment how easy it would be to defraud the Government under the plan proposed. First, the Senator says it costs \$200,000 in his district to collect \$400,000, or very nearly that sum. I believe that was his statement. Suppose it had cost the whole \$400,000 to collect the revenue, it only proves the dishonesty of the men engaged in that business in that district to require so much expenditure in order that the Government shall not be defrauded. But let us examine for a moment and see how it would work. The Senator wants the country to understand that because of the expense in that district the Commissioner of Internal Revenue winked at those frauds, which is not true, for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is an honest man. But because it cost 50 per cent. in that district to collect the revenues the Senator would like to have the country understand that that is the expensive machinery which applies all over this country.

If the Senator would only remember back two or three years I suppose he would recollect what it was that cost the Government so much. It was to protect the lives of officers of this Government; it was to keep them from being assassinated; it was to prevent men from perpetrating murder in order that they might rob and plunder the Government of this revenue. The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows that the whole cost of collecting the internal revenue of this Government is 3½ per cent. My State pays \$23,000,000 of this revenue, while the Senator's State pays comparatively a mere bagatelle. My State pays more revenue into the Treasury of the United States than every Southern State put together. It is for the protection of the States that pay the revenue that the expenditure of the Government is necessary in protecting the Government against fraud by these distillers in the mountains. If you require the distillers of spirits to pay from ten, fifteen to twenty million dollars revenue they expect from this Government that it will be required as well that they shall be protected by the Government in the collection of its revenue, and that the Government will require the small distillers as well distilling all over the country to honestly pay the revenue to the Government instead of putting their whiskies on the market without paying the revenues, thus forcing the distillers in the North to pay the large amount of revenues to the country and engage themselves perhaps if they are inclined to be dishonest and to act in fraud against the Government in order to protect themselves.

It seems that Senators representing certain Democratic localities want protection of every kind of everything they produce. They want the Northern States to pay the revenues, first the duties that are collected from foreign imports; then they want the Northern States to pay the revenues that are assessed as internal taxes, and at the same time they want high protection on their dutiable goods. At the same time they want the internal revenue wiped out so far as they are concerned, or at least I refer to the Senator from North Carolina. That would be the result of his proposition, whether it is his intention or not.

The moment that you allow these men to prosecute this work merely by giving a license to the Government that very moment you tell them to commit every character of fraud that is known in the catalogue of frauds. You notify them that there is no eye to watch them, that there is no officer near them, that there is no one to bother or interfere with them while they are prosecuting their work and their labors; but at the end of a certain term they will have to come up and make an affidavit that that is all the whisky they have distilled, and that is all the tax they will be required to pay. If the distiller is so honest that he will not perpetrate a fraud by making a false affidavit, I suppose the same character of men that he speaks of that run the distilleries

down there could be procured very easily, doubtless there are many of them all over the country, North and South too, that could be procured to make affidavits as to the amount of liquors they had made. It is very easy to allow a distillery to be run in the name of any person and the name of the owner to be unknown. It is a simple proposition, and this proposition of the Senator from North Carolina is a proposition to perpetrate fraud against the Government.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VANCE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORRILL. I trust we may have a vote at the present time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. Before the vote is taken I should like to make a few remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there a second for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. Mr. President—

Mr. VANCE. I do not propose to be taken off my feet by a call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The thirty-ninth rule takes you off your feet.

Mr. VANCE. And the fortieth rule will keep me on them.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. Will the forty-first rule take me off of mine?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from North Carolina will be recognized as soon as the Senator from Pennsylvania concludes.

Mr. VANCE. Very well, if the Senator from Pennsylvania was recognized first; but I shall claim the floor and hold it as my right and at my pleasure.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. My impression is that I gave up the floor some time since to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has decided that the Senator from Pennsylvania is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. I do not wish to speak upon the matter which has just been under discussion, but I desire to submit a few remarks upon the tariff question generally. It may appear somewhat odd that I should submit them at this time, but I think it is best that what I have to say should be said now.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the assertion that there is a demand for a general readjustment of the tariff. There is no such demand. What the people need is relief from internal taxation. They do not believe that protection is really taxation. Neither do I. I do not believe that this discussion has been beneficial. It has paralyzed trade for months, and will probably paralyze it for a year or more to come. Let us devote ourselves to the reduction of internal revenue, which is taxation. Pass a bill which will take off all internal taxation, but stop at that and let the tariff alone. I am inclined to this opinion because I think it best for the country and because I want the Republican party to be the party of protection, and of protection for the whole country. There have been too many individual interests at work trying to control its readjustment, and which come here and ask for something for themselves, for their penknives, or their cotton-gins, or their files, or their saws, or whatever they individually manufacture. I do not believe in this kind of protection. I believe in protection as a principle. I believe in it because I think it is the only way that this great country, in all its surroundings and characteristics, can have prosperity.

Protection means prosperity for all our people. I want protection for the Carolinas in their rice, for Georgia in her cotton, for Louisiana in her sugar, for Alabama, the Virginias, Pennsylvania, New York, and for all the other States, in whatever industries and productions are best suited to them. Believing this, however, I do not believe in trading. I will never trade one interest in my State to help gain the interests of another State. I have no right to criticize the actions of other Senators, nor have I the slightest intention to make any personal reflections; but I want to say that the Republican party for more than twenty-five years has proclaimed protection from the house-tops, and it is a principle which has saved us over and over again; and conspicuously so in the last canvass, when Indiana itself was carried for protection and because of the assertion that we were protectionists, not because we wanted to help the glass manufacturers of that State, not because we wanted to help any simple interest, not because we were for protecting any particular industry in that State, but because we were protectionists generally. Yet when we come together here we act simply each man for the particular interest of his own constituents. That is unfair and unreasonable. If individual interests are to control in the readjustment of the tariff, each bargaining and arranging with the other, then I am against this whole measure. I am a protectionist, not in the interest of this or that industry, but for the welfare of the whole country.

Why should our people buy a toy from Germany instead of buying one that is made in America? Why should they buy cheap cotton and woolen cloth that comes from England? Why should they buy wool that comes from Australia? Why should they import sugar from the West Indies and cheap machinery from England? Why should they contribute to the prosperity of other countries at the expense of their own? I am in favor of the utmost freedom of trade between the States of this Union, but of the highest possible protection against other coun-

tries for everything that we can produce ourselves. If people wish to buy the products of other countries instead of our own, then let them pay for them. But this protection must be framed for the benefit of the country at large, not of certain special interests and not by agreements between those interests.

Let there be no attempt at a bargain. If there is any attempt at trading, if there is any attempt to make a compromise, I am against it as absolutely and unqualifiedly as the most extreme free-trader in the Senate. For him I have respect. He believes honestly in his doctrine of free trade, and he has the courage to proclaim it. This is his honest conviction, and he thinks we should have free trade for everything. I differ with him *in toto*; but I say let us have one thing or the other. Let us have free trade or protection, but let us have no bargaining. Let us be courageous enough to do what we believe to be right.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report to-morrow morning a bill to reduce internal-revenue taxation without any tariff amendment.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. MORRILL. Of course that is not in order.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. We will try the sense of the Senate upon it. I think it is in order.

Mr. INGALLS. Why is it not in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is in order.

Mr. MORRILL. It is a resolution, and therefore must lie over one day.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. It is not a resolution. I offer it as a simple motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is in order, but the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] has the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. The motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is pending, I suppose?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Yes, the motion is pending, but the Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. So I understand.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, I am very sorry that this amendment of mine has led to any discussion and delay. Notwithstanding the intimation to the contrary, such was not my intention. But it is an important matter, and I propose to say a very few brief words in reply to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN]. He says that the proposition I have had the honor to make is one having a tendency to increase fraud, and that the argument I make only proves the dishonesty of the distillers and the officers engaged in the collection of the revenue, and that to remove the officers would increase the fraud rather than have any tendency to repress it.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator misunderstands me if he says I suggested to remove the officers who committed fraud. I did not say that.

Mr. VANCE. The Senator, then, does not admit that the Government's officers have been guilty of any fraud.

Mr. LOGAN. I have not anything to say as to whether they have or have not, but I understood the Senator to say those men are out of office, and I said the fact of a man committing fraud did not prove that the law was wrong, it only showed that the man was wrong, and that the removal of him was the removal of fraud, so far as he was concerned, which is true.

Mr. VANCE. If a man is committing frauds in partnership with a Government officer there is very little chance for detecting him. If he was required to take out a license there would be no fraud in the payment of the money for the license; he would be subject to visitation, and the distiller would be subject to have his distillery seized if found running without a license, just as it is now.

Is there anything so monstrous in the proposition that a man should be required to state on oath the amount of his property subject to taxation? Is not that the way taxes are paid in all the States of this Union, in all counties and corporate associations of the Union? Should a man be deemed a rascal simply because he is required to go to some officer of the United States Government and pay for this license? All the State governments and all the corporate governments of the country in levying taxes simply require the citizen to come up and render a schedule of his property and to swear to it, and there is the end of it. It is done that way all over this country, except in regard to the internal revenue. It is that way in a great many other things that are taxed for internal revenue. Bank officers do not have a man to sit down and see the amount of their circulation. The importers are simply required to swear to their invoices in the custom-house when they import goods. Bank officers simply render an account of the taxation due to the Government and swear to it. A citizen of the State renders the amount of tax due to the State under the laws of the State, and he swears to it, and that is the end of it. But the moment a man distills his grain the Government takes it for granted that he is a scoundrel and puts another man there to watch him.

I think the monstrosity about that proposition is its absurdity. If a man can be trusted in one thing he can be trusted in another. Even now no storekeeper sits down to watch a distiller distilling fruit. The distiller distills fruit and the Government gauger goes around to gauge it, and the distiller renders an account on oath of the amount distilled. Why should he not do that with his grain?

I should like to know if the Senator from Illinois has forgotten some frauds that were perpetrated in his country; out in the western country somewhere, not long ago? It seems to me I have heard of a man by the name of McDonald, and a man by the name of Joyce, and a man by the name of Babcock, who stole more money from the Government at one clip than the whole amount of the distillation of grain and fruit in North Carolina would amount to in five years. Yet the Senator talks about the dishonesty of distillers in the State of North Carolina. I know there is a tendency in all men to overreach the Government in taxation matters. I know that is universally the failing; but at the same time I beg Senators to remember that the poor men in the mountains of our country who are running a four-bushel distillery have not half the temptation to commit frauds that persons have in the great distilleries of the West, where millions can be swooped up at once.

My humble and honest opinion is that if these men were treated with proper consideration, if they were allowed to take out a license, and if the amount to be paid for it should be based on the capacity of their stills, and they were put on oath as to the amount they distilled, and they were required to render it thus for taxation and were not beset by the Government as they are, it is my honest opinion, I say, that the amount they would defraud the Government of would not be anything like half equal to the amount paid to officers used to recruit for the Republican party. That is the notion I have about it.

In that one district, as I said before, in 1881 the collections amounted only to \$499,000 and a fraction, and the expense of collection amounted to \$268,000, leaving \$221,000 to the Government. Could those men engaged in that business, supposing they had paid a pretty heavy license-tax, and supposing that they had rendered some of the quantity that they had distilled for taxation, possibly have cheated the Government out of as much as it took to pay for the collection? That is the question.

I admit that the scheme is somewhat obnoxious to the comments of the Senator from Illinois, I admit that it is imperfect, I admit that the whole thing ought to be wiped out. The only way to cure that evil is to wipe it entirely out. It is a tax obnoxious to the spirit of freemen; it is a tax obnoxious to the spirit of our institutions and to the feelings of our people everywhere. I acknowledge that; but the Senate decided that it would not so abolish it, and this amendment seeks to abolish the evil of having armies of men spread out through the country engaged in dishonest practices, in campaigning for a party and making all the money they can out of the offices that they are intrusted with; and it seeks to save the Treasury the expense of this vast horde of officers. That is what I hope to effect by this motion. I have had no other desire in the matter whatever.

I am now, as I said when I made my first few remarks, perfectly willing for a vote. I do not want to extend the discussion any longer, but as long as I am assailed of course I shall be obliged to reply. The Senator said a good deal about the danger to life in that country, and he alluded to the report of the Commissioner about the number of officers who had been shot and killed. That is unfortunately true; but the report of the Commissioner took very great care not to show the number of men who had been slain by the revenue officers. If the Senator will read the testimony taken before the committee he will see something of that, but very little of it, because the committee decided that they could not go into this thing prior to a certain date. He will find that in that country where one revenue officer had been killed at least three of the people of that country had been slain by revenue officers or United States marshals acting with them. He will find cases that will shock the sense of justice of any Senator on this floor; he would find a case where a marshal traveling in company with a deputy collector for the purpose ostensibly of collecting internal revenue halted a man in the road, against whom he had no warrant, and when the man, being alarmed, started to run, the marshal shot him down in his tracks. He was taken to the Federal court and pleaded that it was done in the discharge of his duty and he was acquitted. I could cite the Senate to a dozen instances of that kind in North Carolina; and if you, Mr. President, or Senators here, could be aware of the tyranny of this horde of United States officials through that country and the manner in which they have trampled upon and defied the feelings and prejudices of the people among whom they were pretending to execute the law, I am sure that you would do justice to those unfortunate people. They have been more sinned against than sinning in this matter of the collection of internal revenue. Five outrages have been committed by officers of the Government upon the people to whom one has been committed by the people upon the officers of the Government. If the Internal Revenue Commissioner's reports would only show the true state of things there, and how where men were indicted in the State courts for flagrant violations of law against the lives and property of citizens they would take their cases into the Federal court, which was generally the end of them, I am sure the feeling would be different. I have never known one to be punished yet in the Federal courts for any outrage committed on the people of that country. Nor do I mean to reflect on the courts there; but it somehow happens that they always escape, so far as I am aware of the facts.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I am always glad in matters that I am conversant with, and I do not claim to be very much so with this, to

engage in discussion with gentlemen where we have legitimate discussion. The Senator from North Carolina is somewhat unfortunate in his reply to the remarks I made in saying that I was accusing the people of North Carolina, that is the distillers, of being dishonest. The Senator himself proved their dishonesty by his own statement, and I was only replying to that. He said that they had distilled more whisky that they had not paid the tax on than they had distilled whisky that they did pay the tax on, and it was his own statement against his own constituents showing their dishonesty to which I replied, asking him if he desired to put the Government in the hands of that character of men and merely take their affidavits for the amount of whisky that they distill. He says again that they have to swear now to the production, and he was equally unfortunate in his illustration. He said that the duties collected on goods imported to this country did not have a vigil over them that those had which paid this form of internal-revenue tax. The Senator will see, if he will reflect, that he is mistaken.

There can not be one dollar's worth of goods imported brought into this country that does not have to pass through the custom-house. The officers inspect every article and require an affidavit to it besides. The custom-houses have inspectors, secret agents, examiners, weighers, and watchers. He knows that if he understands the laws regulating the customs of the country. So it is in the collection of the internal revenue on the same principle that they have men to examine the goods. How can a man examine the spirits distilled at a distillery unless he has the opportunity of knowing the quantity that is made? It is only in following out the principle that Congress adopted for the purpose of protecting the Government in the collection of their revenue that this revenue law is now in existence.

In reference to what the Senator said about crimes in the South I do not care to go into that. I do not care to bandy words about who stole whisky or who did not. It is not an argument against the execution of the law, but it is a strong argument in favor of it. The fact that frauds could be committed while we have a law giving a watch over every gallon of whisky that is distilled, only shows greater necessity for having vigilance. I have nothing to say about persons that the Senator referred to as having robbed the Government; though as to citizens of Illinois being implicated, he is mistaken in that.

Mr. VANCE. If the Senator please, I said the "western country."

Mr. LOGAN. I will state it a little stronger than the Senator did. There were citizens of Illinois who did rob the Government and the Government sent them to jail and put them in a penitentiary for doing it. That is exactly where your distillers ought to have gone who swore that they distilled more whisky than they paid the revenue tax on, and if they had been properly followed under the law they would have gone to the penitentiary where the men in Illinois who robbed the Government went. They would have gone to the same place or another one like it. That is the difference between the execution of the law in North Carolina and in Illinois. We sent our violators of the law to the penitentiary. I do not know what you did with yours.

I do not know anything about it. As I said I do not want to discuss that kind of a proposition in connection with this proposed law. It is a mere question as to whether this in my judgment as proposed will affect the revenues either in favor of the Government or against it. I do not wish to go over the argument again, but I have stated the reasons of the objections to this proposed change in the law and the reasons why it ought not to be adopted because it tended to fraud, because it invites fraud. I think frauds would be committed under it and you could not escape it.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate a suggestion in regard to a final vote upon this bill. The bill has been debated now for about eight weeks, I think very nearly. It has been fully discussed in Committee of the Whole and in the Senate, and all the amendments adopted as in Committee of the Whole have passed under the review of the Senate. Not only that, but many others have been added.

There must be an end to all things, and there should be an end to the discussion of this bill, however important it may be, and no man recognizes its importance or the importance of the subject more than I do. It was for that reason that I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to unship and disturb the action of the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and in the Senate upon the salt question. It had been debated almost infinitely and a decision had been reached, and I thought it time to let it come to an end.

I desire for one that the bill shall reach a legitimate end, which is, that it shall be voted upon by the Senate favorably or unfavorably, but that the end shall come in the regular way, and that it shall not be postponed and die simply of continued postponement. I have nothing to say to Senators on this side of the Chamber or the other side of the Senate as to delay or obstruction and the like. The record will speak for itself and it will show at least the time that has been occupied. Whether it will show the animus of the occupation of that time or not I do not mean to say, but it will show how far in the regular orderly way the amendments to this bill have been debated and for what object.

There are amendments that still should be offered to the bill. I have one in particular which I desire to submit to the Senate without any further debate, if need be. It is an amendment that I offered and withdrew at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] who

said he proposed to offer a substitute. Other amendments have been offered but no substitute for the proposition has been made. Still I want an opportunity to bring the matter before the Senate and have a vote upon it.

Now, I suggest at 2 o'clock to-morrow the Senate proceed to vote upon the amendments to the bill without further debate upon the subject. Why can not that be done?

Mr. DAVIS, of West Virginia. On all of them?

Mr. BAYARD. On all of them; on any amendments that may be offered, but that debate on amendments to the bill shall cease at 2 o'clock to-morrow. That will enable us to reach home by midnight, I suppose, to-night. No one expects, in the present condition of the Senate, with the scant numbers present, that the bill will be disposed of to-night by a vote. Therefore I make that suggestion, and I make it to indicate my judgment and what I believe is the judgment of the Senate, that the bill should come to an end legitimately, and I would call it illegitimate if it is simply talked to death or postponed under the plea and pretense of debate and of amendment.

Instead of 2 o'clock it has been suggested to me by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] that 1 o'clock be named as the time that debate shall cease and when amendments shall be voted on without further debate. I therefore ask that that proposition may be submitted to the Senate by the Chair, and that it may be a unanimous agreement that we shall proceed to vote upon amendments to the bill at 1 o'clock to-morrow and continue until the bill is finished.

Mr. SHERMAN. I want to see a termination brought to this matter as soon as possible. I am willing to take any suggestion that is made on the other side; but some time between now and the close of this debate I desire to offer in pursuance of, as I think the unanimous instruction of the Legislature of Ohio, one amendment, and I shall be content with a ten-minute opportunity to present the facts in regard to it. It is in regard to wool. I could not perform my duty to my State or to the people of my State without presenting the question of the relative duty on wool and woolen goods.

Mr. COCKRELL. Would not the Senator have time between 10 o'clock and 2 o'clock to-morrow to do that? That would be four hours.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I simply wish to enter this caveat so as not to be precluded from having the opportunity of presenting the amendment, so that there may be no question about it hereafter.

Mr. COCKRELL. There will be no question at all about the Senator having the opportunity before 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. One o'clock is now suggested.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then he will have an opportunity between 10 o'clock and 1 o'clock to present his amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. There may be other amendments pressed in that time, and I simply wanted to have it understood.

Mr. COCKRELL. We shall meet at 10 o'clock, and any Senator can get the floor in those three hours and make a ten-minute speech, I take it. Several SENATORS. Offer it now.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would not like to take a vote upon it to-night, because we have barely a quorum, but I am willing to apply to myself the ten-minute rule and to present the simple question, and it is as simple as can be. It is simply raising the duty on wool 2 cents on two grades. I desire to do that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the Senate that the motion pending now is to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. SHERMAN. That would take the bill right from under us, but that motion ought to be put. It is a privileged question. I think we had better adjourn now and agree to take the vote to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HARRIS. Had we not better dispose of the motion to recommit to-night?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us dispose of the motion to recommit. The Senator from Pennsylvania made a motion to recommit the bill. Let us vote on that.

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me that amendments which are to be voted upon at 2 o'clock or at any future time ought to be offered to-night; otherwise amendments of the most important character might be sprung upon the Senate, and nobody would have an opportunity to state the objections to them. It seems to me that if the vote is to be taken at 1 o'clock the amendments ought to be in the Senate by 11 or 12 o'clock, an hour or two before the vote, so that if there is any amendment of special importance we may at least have some time to consider it before voting upon it. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware to modify his suggestion that all amendments should be moved by 12 o'clock to-morrow if they are not ready to-night, and then that the vote shall be taken without further debate, beginning at 2 o'clock. That will be a fair and just proposition, but I submit it would not be fair to put any amendments that are offered after debate has gone by which may be of a very important character.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Ohio proposes to offer an amendment increasing the duty on wool. If that is carried in the Senate it will be necessary to offer amendments to the whole schedule of woolen manufactures, because the one now has been adapted to the other. The woolen manufactures of this country have been running close to the wind for twenty years. Over half the time the woolen manufactures in Indiana have been lying idle, and now if wool is to be restored it

will be done very unjustly. Indeed, unless the whole tariff touching woolen manufactures is revised and adapted to the new increase upon wool, I shall reserve at any rate the right of giving notice that I shall offer amendments increasing the duties on woolen manufactures throughout the schedule.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is not necessary to reserve it. The Senator will have the right under the arrangement proposed.

Mr. MORRILL. I will say that if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should prevail I have a long series of amendments that will be absolutely indispensable to make to the woolen schedule.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly it would be impossible to agree to the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I hope he will not insist upon it. One amendment may necessitate other amendments.

Mr. FRYE. I said what I did hoping to induce the Senator from Ohio not to offer the amendment he indicated. The wool men have agreed once before the committee by their representative to the present rate which has been established on wool.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am authorized to deny that, but I do not want to get into any controversy about it. I do not know anything about it myself, but I am authorized to deny it by the person who it is said agreed to it. I do not want to raise any question of disturbance among private gentlemen. What I do I do in pursuance of the instruction of the highest authority in my State, the Legislature of Ohio. I desire to present the question, not with any feeling at all myself about it, and without any embarrassment in regard to whether other amendments may be reserved. I shall vote for any amendment necessarily to result in consequence of my amendment, if it should prevail. I am willing to offer the amendment now if it is deemed proper.

Mr. BAYARD. There seems to be no disposition to meet the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the amendments should be all offered before 2 o'clock so that none should be offered after that time. But unless I misread the character of the Senate, if it is proposed, under an arrangement of this kind, on a multifarious bill that has been discussed here for nearly two months, a sudden, unexpected amendment that changes the whole character of a tariff rate or of a schedule would savor so much of a trick that I will not suppose that it is intended or that it could be done without a wrongful imputation to the person who attempted it. I did not suppose that. I took it for granted that running through our debates in this body, differing as we may, there was a sense of openness and fair play and notice of what we intended to do all around.

A suggestion of this kind depends upon general consent, the result of what I may call the common sense and judgment of the Senate in dealing with a public question of this character, and dealing with it in the presence of a speedy adjournment and end of the session. We are told by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he will feel it his duty to call up the regular appropriation bills to carry on the Government, and insist upon their consideration after perhaps to-night, he said, but certainly after to-morrow. With the 3d of March, which is our day of adjournment, Saturday night, the 3d of March, the Senate must adjourn; the term expires, and the supplies for this Government must be found, tariff or no tariff, reform or no reform. It is a practical fact, and the question is whether the Senate, in the face of the few days that remain for us, are willing to bring the tariff bill to a test, and vote to pass it or defeat it. If there be anything unreasonable or unfair, of course Senators will object to the proposition; but I take it for granted that we have made some headway, satisfactorily or otherwise, in the discussion of this bill. I regret to hear from the Senator from Ohio that he proposes to reopen the wool schedule as he opened, and reopened, and opened again the schedule of iron duties; but if that be his proposition he should give in his amendments at an early hour to-morrow, in order that amendments to his amendments may be offered.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am willing to give them now.

Mr. BAYARD. Let the Senate have notice of them.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can read them in a moment.

Mr. BAYARD. I hope that some arrangement will be made. I do not think it is so important as to mere details as it is that the end should come to this tariff discussion.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, there is one of the rules of this body that requires Senators to address the Chair and be recognized before they proceed to make very long speeches. This bill was taken up for discussion on the 9th of January, and repeatedly since that time my colleague, in charge of the bill, has implored the other side to come to an understanding to limit debate, so that every gentleman could have his say and say it for once or twice or three times, but stop when he had gotten through, which so few of us know how to do; and every time my colleague has made that proposition the other side has said, "No, no, the liberty of debate is sacred in this Chamber and we will not be confined either in time or space or circumstance in the free expression of our views;" and so for a month and a half nearly, a month and a quarter certainly, we have gone on, my colleague urging us to stay here every day and repeating from time to time this proposition, to which the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, some one or all, have always objected. Now, when there have been one hundred and fifty speeches made in violation of the rules on that other side and a good many on this—

Mr. COCKRELL. Your side has made twice as many.

Mr. EDMUNDS. A good many; I will not take the arithmetic and figure out how many. We have gone on in violation of the thirty-ninth rule, which requires every Senator to speak not more than twice to the same question; and, as my honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] said in the chair to-day about an amendment to strike out another word beside one that had been put in, or a series of words that did not alter the substance, this rule was a rule of substance; but in spite of the rule, over and over again by scores—I do not exaggerate when I say by scores—of times Senators have stood up to debate the same proposition over and over again. Some of us have not been conspicuous in debate, although we have stayed within the reach of the roll-call every time.

Now we come down to the critical point of this bill, as to the final shape it is to take and the shape in which it is to go to the House of Representatives. Now up stands my distinguished friend from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] and says that his side have got the benefit of unlimited and repeated and reiterated debate on every proposition a thousand times over, at this last moment when the passage, in my opinion, of any bill about the tariff is utterly hopeless, and says now let us cut off all debate to-morrow afternoon at 1 or 2 o'clock and go it blind the rest of the time.

That is a commentary upon political and human consistency it must be admitted. I do not think my friend from Delaware has made the objection, but his political friends have every time that my colleague has proposed that every man should have his say and time enough to say it on every proposition. Having got the benefit of that performance for five or six weeks, it is proposed that now, when we come to the critical point, everybody's mouth shall be closed and we shall run for chances. Is that a good thing to do? I have not said anything yet about this bill; I have not occupied three minutes; I have said nothing, except two or three inquiries. When the question comes, as the thing now stands, on the adoption of this tariff amendment to the internal-revenue bill I shall have something to say and I intend to say it. Therefore I do not agree to the proposition.

Mr. CALL. I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator wish it printed? It will be received and laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN. It is evident—

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator will allow me to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Mississippi offers an amendment to be printed, the Chair understands.

Mr. ROLLINS. Are amendments to the bill in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no amendment in order now; but amendments will be received by the Secretary. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has the floor.

Mr. DAWES. I hope the Secretary will keep the amendments for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROLLINS. I wish my amendment printed.

Mr. BROWN. As I commenced to remark, it is very evident to every Senator present that there is no possible chance to get a vote on this question to-night, and it is further very evident that we shall come to no agreement about a vote at a particular hour to-morrow. The Senate has now been nearly thirteen hours in continuous session, and I move that it do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLAIR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. If he were here, I should vote "nay;" but I have the right to vote if it is necessary to keep a quorum.

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR], but I can vote on the question of adjournment, and therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator can vote "nay."

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 8, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—8.			
Brown, Coke,	Hampton, Jonas,	Jones of Florida, Ransom,	Vance, Walker.
NAYS—44.			
Aldrich, Allison, Anthony, Bayard, Beck, Call, Camden, Cameron of Wis., Cockrell, Conger, Davis of Ill.,	Davis of W. Va., Dawes, Farley, Frye, George, Gorman, Groome, Harris, Harrison, Hawley, Hoar,	Ingalls, Jackson, Jones of Nevada, Kellogg, Logan, McDill, McMillan, Miller of Cal., Miller of N. Y., Morrill, Platt,	Plumb, Pugh, Rollins, Sewell, Sherman, Slater, Tabor, Vest, Voorhees, Williams, Windom.

ABSENT—24.

Barrow,
Blair,
Butler,
Cameron of Pa.,
Edmunds,
Fair,

Ferry,
Garland,
Grover,
Hale,
Hill,
Johnston,

Lamar,
Lapham,
McPherson,
Mahone,
Maxey,
Mitchell,

Morgan,
Pendleton,
Saulsbury,
Saunders,
Sawyer,
Van Wyck.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report the same tomorrow morning, omitting therefrom all provisions relating to duties on foreign imports.

Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. MORRILL, and Mr. ROLLINS called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORRILL. Were not the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]?

Mr. EDMUNDS. But this precedes that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A motion to commit takes precedence of a motion to amend.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). I am generally paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. I rather incline to think he would vote for this motion, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR], but I understand he would vote "nay" if present, and therefore I take the responsibility of voting "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]; but I understand he would vote "nay" if present, and I vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. BROWN (after having noted in the negative). I am paired for the rest of the evening with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK]. I did not hear his name called as having voted, and as he did not vote I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW].

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 46; as follows:

YEAS—4.

Cameron of Pa.,

Jones of Nevada, Sewell,

Vest.

NAYS—46.

Aldrich,
Allison,
Anthony,
Bayard,
Beck,
Call,
Camden,
Cameron of Wis.,
Cockrell,
Coke,
Conger,
Davis of Ill.,

Davis of W. Va.,
Dawes,
Farley,
Frye,
George,
Gorman,
Groome,
Hampton,
Harris,
Harrison,
Hawley,
Hoar,

Ingalls,
Jackson,
Jonas,
Jones of Florida,
Kellogg,
Logan,
McDill,
McMillan,
Miller of Cal.,
Miller of N. Y.,
Morgan,
Morrill,

Platt,

Plumb,

Pugh,

Rollins,

Slater,

Tabor,

Vance,

Walker,

Williams,

Windom.

ABSENT—26.

Barrow,
Blair,
Brown,
Butler,
Edmunds,
Fair,
Ferry,

Garland,
Grover,
Hale,
Hill,
Johnston,
Lamar,
Lapham,

McPherson,
Mahone,
Maxey,
Mitchell,
Pendleton,
Ransom,
Saulsbury,

Saunders,
Sawyer,
Sherman,
Van Wyck,
Voorhees.

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. PLATT. May I propose an amendment to be in order for tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator has the right to have it read.

The Acting Secretary read the amendment.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN (when his name was called). As I have already announced, I am paired for the rest of the evening with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. VAN WYCK]. I shall not announce the pair again. If he were present, I should vote "yea" on this amendment.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. If he were here, I should vote "nay," and I do not know but that he would also.

Mr. JONAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Sena-

tor from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. McDILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR]. If he were here, I think he would vote "yea," and I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY].

Mr. BLAIR. I announce my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BARROW].

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 37; as follows:

YEAS—11.

Call,
Coke,
George,

Hampton,
Harris,
Jackson,

Pugh,
Ransom,
Vance,

Vest,
Walker.

NAYS—37.

Aldrich,
Allison,
Anthony,
Bayard,
Beck,
Camden,
Cameron of Wis.,
Cockrell,
Conger,
Davis of Ill.,

Davis of W. Va.,
Dawes,
Farley,
Frye,
Gorman,
Groome,
Harrison,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Ingalls,

Jones of Nevada,
Kellogg,
Logan,
McMillan,
McPherson,
Miller of Cal.,
Miller of N. Y.,
Morrill,
Platt,
Plumb,

Rollins,
Sewell,
Sherman,
Slater,
Tabor,
Williams,
Windom.

ABSENT—28.

Barrow,
Blair,
Brown,
Butler,
Cameron of Pa.,
Edmunds,
Fair,

Ferry,
Garland,
Grover,
Hale,
Hill,
Johnston,
Jonas,

Jones of Florida,
Lamar,
Lapham,
McDill,
Mahone,
Maxey,
Mitchell,

Morgan,
Pendleton,
Saulsbury,
Saunders,
Sawyer,
Van Wyck,
Voorhees.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLUMB. On page 14 of the last print of the bill, at line 245, I move to strike out after the word "dry" the words "20 per cent. ad valorem," and insert "three-fourths of a cent a pound." The old duty was 1 cent per pound and this will be a reduction of 25 per cent. I am assured that this is a very important matter.

Mr. EDMUNDS. To what subject does it relate?

The ACTING SECRETARY. If amended as proposed, the paragraph will read:

Whiting and Paris white, dry, three-fourths of a cent a pound; ground in oil, or putty, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BECK. Will somebody state what that increase is? Putty is a thing that everybody needs to get reasonably cheap. I expect it is a very large increase of duty.

Mr. PLUMB. That is true as to whiting. Paris white is an article which is used for various purposes. The present rate of duty is 1 cent per pound. The trouble about grading the two articles is that they are so nearly alike to the sight and touch that it is almost impossible to separate them, so that if a duty were put according to the grade of value, which is a difference of about 100 per cent., it would be almost impossible to prevent the importation of Paris white as whiting and consequently at a low rate of duty.

Mr. BECK. We want to get these things as cheap as we can in order to mix other things with them.

Mr. PLUMB. That is true; but the discrimination between the two would be ineffective.

Mr. BECK. I do not propose to make any delay about this.

Mr. COCKRELL. What ad valorem would three-fourths of a cent a pound be?

Mr. PLUMB. I can not tell exactly what the ad valorem would be.

Mr. EDMUNDS. At retail it would be about 75 per cent. and at wholesale probably about 30.

Mr. BECK. I want as far as I can to obtain all those things that are the raw material for products as cheap as we can possibly get them, so that we can have the benefit of them. If we go to putting on high tariffs upon all the raw materials, then there is no way of getting cheap products. This is one of the raw materials.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator will bear in mind that this whiting when it goes into putty has received all the manufacture it can practically get for the purpose of making putty. It has been mined, taken from the ground, transported, dried, ground, and almost calcined; at all events it has gone through a number of processes before it becomes manufactured putty, and, in fact, it is the manufactured article of which putty is composed. It is only mixed with oil to make putty, and therefore it is not within the rule which the Senator states.

Mr. BECK. I can express my idea in a minute. We have kept up the taxes on dye-stuffs and we have put nutmegs that bring us in \$572,000 revenue on the free-list. We have put unground pepper and pimento, that bring in nearly \$500,000 more, on the free-list, and we keep aniline dyes and other things up at 40 and 50 and some 100 per cent. that everybody who bleaches clothes needs. I would keep pepper, nutmegs, and all those things on the dutiable list and receive \$1,000,000 from them, and I would take the \$1,000,000 off the raw materials which the manufacturers need. That is the way I would do it; and because

this is one of the things every manufacturer wants and everybody who puts a pane of glass in his window wants, I desire to have it as cheap as possible.

If this is continued I give notice that I shall move to put nutmegs and pimento and those things that bring us in \$1,000,000 now back where they were and take off dyes and other things which manufacturers need to produce their products. I want putty as cheap as possible.

Mr. SHERMAN. The present duty of 1 cent a pound is put down at 258 per cent. ad valorem. The amount of importation is 1,722,711 pounds. The whole value of that is \$6,675.95 and the duty is certified as \$17,227.11. It seems to me it is rather too steep to put that up.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator will see under the enormous reduction made by this bill that duty is not prohibitory.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think 30 per cent. might be too low; but this would be an enormous duty.

Mr. PLUMB. It would be reducing it more than ten times.

Mr. SHERMAN. Surely to put it on as good a footing as rice would be reasonable—100 per cent. A quarter of a cent. a pound would be a very high rate of duty.

Mr. PLUMB. That would be very true, but the difference between that duty and the present, as there were importations under the old, serves to show what the effect would be. If the duty was reduced as proposed by the Senator from Ohio I am advised it would probably close eighteen institutions of this sort in New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERMAN. Do we import putty into this country?

Mr. PLUMB. Yes, sir. I am assured that there are contracts out for the coming year based upon a continuance of the present duty, and that if the duty established by this bill shall prevail the contracts will be canceled, and of necessity the manufacturers will be required to stop.

Mr. MORRILL. There is a great difference in the value of Paris white and whitening. The whitening is a very cheap article; Paris white is an article that is consumed mainly for calcimining and for whitening the walls inside of houses. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I think, although the present duty is 1 cent a pound, the price has gone down very much, and I suggest to him that he ask no more than half a cent a pound; and that, taking the Paris white and whitening together, I think would be low enough.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. MORRILL. I move to amend by making it half a cent a pound.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. BECK. How much increase is that from what is now in the bill?

Mr. PLUMB. It would be a reduction of 50 per cent. on the present duty.

Mr. BECK. But on the duty in the bill? If it doubles the present duty I think we had better vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] as amended.

Mr. PLUMB called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). My pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM] is transferred to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM]. I vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I vote, as my vote seems necessary to make a quorum.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Kellogg,	Sewell,
Allison,	Frye,	Logan,	Sherman,
Anthony,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Tabor.
Cameron of Wis.,	Harrison,	Platt,	
Conger,	Hawley,	Plumb,	
Dawes,	Ingalls,	Rollins,	

NAYS—18.

Bayard,	Coke,	Hoar,	Vance,
Beck,	Davis of Ill.,	Jackson,	Walker,
Call,	Farley,	Miller of Cal.,	Williams.
Camden,	Groome,	Morgan,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Slater,	

ABSENT—37.

Barrow,	Grover,	McDill,	Saulsbury,
Blair,	Hale,	McMillan,	Saunders,
Brown,	Hampton,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Butler,	Hill,	Mahone,	Van Wyck,
Cameron of Pa.,	Johnston,	Maxey,	Vest,
Davis of W. Va.,	Jonas,	Miller of N. Y.,	Voorhees,
Fair,	Jones of Florida,	Mitchell,	Windom.
Ferry,	Jones of Nevada,	Pendleton,	
Garland,	Lamar,	Pugh,	
George,	Lapham,	Ransom,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONGER. On page 38 of the last print of the bill, in lines 823 and 824, copper cement is put in the line with—

Copper, imported in the form of ores, and copper cement, 2½ cents on each pound of fine copper contained therein.

I make the motion that I thought prevailed before, that it be changed from that place and come in at line 826, after "regulus of, and black or coarse copper;" I thought it was accepted, copper cement being pure copper, containing from 75 to 80 per cent. of copper.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary says nothing was done about it.

Mr. CONGER. I see by the reprint of the bill it was not understood. I ask that the change be made.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be reported.

Mr. CONGER. I move to strike out "copper cement," in line 823 of the last print of the bill, on page 38, and insert these words after the words "regulus of, and black or coarse copper," in line 826, so that the cement shall come in at the same duty as regulus of copper.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 823, after the word "ores," it is proposed to strike out "and copper cement," and in line 826, after the word "copper," to insert "and copper cement."

Mr. CONGER. That is the place where it ought to be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the transposition?

Mr. BECK. I do not understand why the rate should be 3½ cents a pound on copper cement.

Mr. CONGER. Because copper cement is almost all pure copper, and it is easily reduced and is more valuable than "regulus of, and black or coarse copper." It ought to come in that line; that was admitted by those who spoke here when it was brought up before. There ought to be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BECK. Everything seems to be working along to increase as fast as we can.

Mr. CONGER. It is only 3½ cents a pound on the "fine copper contained therein," not on the weight.

Mr. BECK. I do not know anything about it. I think the duty on copper ore ought to be reduced to a cent a pound.

Mr. CONGER. No one has denied that this ought to come in the proper place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. CONGER].

Mr. CONGER. It was admitted by the committee that it should come in here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection to the transposition suggested by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONGER. I desire to give notice that before the bill is finished I shall ask at the proper time to take from the free-list, in line 2132:

Bells, old, and bell-metal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now pending is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. CONGER].

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does the transposition put it into a class with a different rate?

Mr. CONGER. It changes it from the common ores and puts it with "regulus of, and black or coarse copper." It is a better quality of copper than either.

Mr. EDMUNDS. And therefore increase the rate.

Mr. CONGER. And therefore increases the rate to 3½ cents a pound on the fine copper contained therein.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is right that we should all understand it.

Mr. CONGER. Yes, sir; I tried to make it understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONGER. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONGER. I desire to repeat again that all who are familiar with this recognize the fact that this being a copper of more value than even the "regulus of, and black or coarse copper," it should be in that list rather than in the list of copper ores. I do not suppose there can be any objection to that.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND]. I do not know which way he would vote.

Mr. HILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY] on this question.

Mr. JONAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON].

Mr. SEWELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CAMDEN].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON]. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I vote "nay."

Mr. PLATT. I have the right to vote to make a quorum. If my vote is necessary, I vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL. I also reserved the right to vote to make a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a quorum voting. The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 17; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Aldrich,	Frye,	Logan,	Plumb,
Anthony,	Harrison,	McMillan,	Rollins,
Blair,	Hawley,	Miller of Cal.,	Sherman,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hoar,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor,
Conger,	Jones of Nevada,	Morrill,	Windom.
Dawes,	Kellogg,	Platt,	

NAYS—17.

Bayard,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Voorhees,
Call,	George,	Jackson,	Williams.
Cockrell,	Gorman,	Morgan,	
Davis of Ill.,	Groome,	Slater,	
Davis of W. Va.,	Harris,	Vest,	

ABSENT—36.

Allison,	Farley,	Jones of Florida,	Pugh,
Barrow,	Ferry,	Lamar,	Ransom,
Beck,	Garland,	Lapham,	Saulsbury,
Brown,	Grover,	McDill,	Saunders,
Butler,	Hale,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Camden,	Hampton,	Mahone,	Sewell,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hill,	Maxey,	Vance,
Coke,	Johnston,	Mitchell,	Van Wyck,
Fair,	Jonas,	Pendleton,	Walker.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I offer the following, to come in at the close of section 5:

SEC. —. That on and after the 1st day of July, 1883, there shall be annually levied, collected, and paid, under such regulations and forms as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, a tax of 3 per cent. upon the dividends, including interest on all bonds, whether cash, scrip, stock, or otherwise, of all corporations, of whatever character or nature, transacting business under corporate functions authorized or to be authorized by any law, Federal, State, county, Territorial, or municipal, which tax shall be annually collected from the said corporations: *Provided*, That all dividends so made liable to said tax, other than cash dividends, shall be estimated at the actual value thereof.

SEC. —. That it shall be the duty of every such corporation to make due return of all dividends, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and in default of such returns it shall be lawful for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make estimate thereof upon the best information he can obtain. And for any neglect or refusal to make said returns or payment thereupon, any such corporation so in default shall pay a penalty of \$1,000 in addition to other penalties and forfeitures prescribed by law for violation of internal-revenue provisions.

SEC. —. That it shall be lawful for said corporations to withhold from the beneficiary or beneficiaries of any such dividend or dividends the amount of tax so levied and to be collected and paid under the provisions hereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. PLUMB. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLISON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON]. I should vote "nay" if he were here.

Mr. CAMDEN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], but understanding that he would vote the same way I would, I vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I vote.

Mr. BLAIR. I vote.

Mr. MCDILL. I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR], reserving, however, the right to vote to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. ALLISON. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 33; as follows:

YEAS—8.

Cockrell,	George,	Plumb,	Vest,
Edmunds,	Morgan,	Slater,	Voorhees.

NAYS—33.

Allison,	Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Rollins,
Anthony,	Frye,	Kellogg,	Sewell,
Bayard,	Gorman,	Logan,	Sherman,
Blair,	Groome,	McDill,	Tabor,
Camden,	Harris,	McMillan,	Williams,
Cameron of Wis.,	Harrison,	Miller of Cal.,	Windom.
Conger,	Hawley,	Miller of N. Y.,	
Davis of Ill.,	Hoar,	Morrill,	
Davis of W. Va.,	Ingalls,	Platt,	

ABSENT—35.

Aldrich,	Farley,	Jonas,	Pugh,
Barrow,	Ferry,	Jones of Florida,	Ransom,
Beck,	Garland,	Lamar,	Saulsbury,
Brown,	Grover,	Lapham,	Saunders,
Butler,	Hale,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Call,	Hampton,	Mahone,	Vance,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hill,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Coke,	Jackson,	Mitchell,	Walker.
Fair,	Johnston,	Pendleton,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer the following amendment, to be inserted at the end of line 1683:

A drawback of 75 cents per ton shall be allowed on all bituminous coal imported into the United States which is afterward used for fuel on board of vessels propelled by steam which are engaged in the coasting trade of the United

States, or in the trade with foreign countries, to be allowed and paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

I wish to say a very few words about the amendment. I am informed by men who are familiar with the subject that ships that cross the Atlantic Ocean coming to our ports bring with them a supply of coal for the round trip. Coals that are brought for the purposes of steam are bituminous coals. If they are entered at the ports of the United States they must pay a tax of 75 cents a ton. The result is that we lose a market for all those imports that cross the Atlantic Ocean, or a greater part of them. Cargoes coming in this direction are lighter than cargoes going out, because we export more heavily than we import. I do not know how this affects the freights; I have not inquired on that subject. I should think though, naturally, that the freights would be increased because of the fact that ships have to load up the coal for the round trip. So much for the Atlantic ports. What we lose by refusing to give this drawback in our Atlantic ports is the sale of the coal that is necessary to carry the ships across the Atlantic Ocean after they have reached our ports.

Now we come to the Gulf of Mexico. The coals of Alabama, as I have before observed to the Senate, have been subjected to a test in the Navy of the United States, and they are found to be equal if not of superior quality to any other coals for steaming purposes. There is not the slightest danger of spontaneous combustion on board a ship that is furnished with these coals. The coal-mines of Alabama are connected with the Gulf by a railway system and also by river navigation within a distance of forty to sixty miles from the main parts of the coal-fields. So we shall gain in furnishing the steam marine in the Gulf of Mexico quite a large amount of money to my State if the tariff of 75 cents on the ton is maintained, but in doing so we shall increase the cost of transportation, which would be unjust to a very large portion of our community, and we should also lessen the opportunities for increasing the steam marine in the Gulf.

I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to offer this amendment for the purpose of cheapening coal to vessels trading coastwise as well as those trading in foreign commerce. When we cross our continent and go to the Pacific Ocean the problem becomes a very grand one. We must in some way manage to have the same control over the commerce of the Pacific Ocean that Great Britain now has over the commerce of the Atlantic Ocean. We can effect this if we will give the slightest encouragement to our steam navigation. It is not less than twenty-four days from the port of San Francisco to Yokohama or to Hong Kong, and there is no intermediate coaling station. A ship that loads at San Francisco for Japan or for China must take a very large amount of coal. I suppose it would be from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of coal that she must carry, and as she loads to come back she must do the same thing, thereby reducing the stowage room for her cargo to a very small comparative space. We ought to furnish all the vessels that we possibly can for conducting the commerce of the Pacific Ocean on terms that are cheaper to steamships.

Now, if we expect to have any valuable commerce on the Pacific Ocean we can not afford to tax that commerce 75 cents per ton on every ton of coal that it burns in crossing that ocean or going down the South American coast.

There may be interests in Alabama, there may be interests in West Virginia and Pennsylvania which might suffer some possible detriment from the release of this fuel from the burden of this tax; but when we come to consider what we should lose in comparison with what this country would gain by getting a drawback upon the coals imported into the United States, that are actually consumed in the foreign commerce of the Pacific Ocean and in the coastwise trade, the comparison sinks into such insignificance in behalf of the protected interests of coal in this country that I think the Senate ought not to consider it for a moment.

I think the Senate will bear me witness that my position is one of impartiality on this question. I am not seeking to protect any particular interest or injure any particular interest, but I do claim that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to release our foreign commerce, especially on the Pacific Ocean, from this very enormous burden. Seventy-five cents a ton on 2,000 tons of coal for a single trip across the Pacific Ocean is certainly a very heavy tax upon commerce. I have appeared here on several occasions as one of the assumed representatives of the agricultural classes. I know that they have more interest in the question of cheap transportation than any other question that can be suggested. I therefore desire to take the vote of the Senate on this measure, in the hope that I may be able to lessen the cost of transportation to those people who have so much to transport abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ALDRICH answered to his name.

Mr. DAVIS, of West Virginia. Mr. President, just one word. Whatever interest or whatever advantage the amendment might have would be to foreign vessels and not to American vessels. In the first place, although it is impossible to regulate it or manage it—

Mr. HOAR. I understand the first name on the roll was called, and that a response was made.

Mr. DAVIS, of West Virginia. Very few in the main will receive any benefit from it.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no impossibility—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the roll-call had been commenced and the first name had answered before the Senator from West Virginia rose.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from West Virginia preceded me, and I supposed I might follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not aware of the fact until after the Senator from West Virginia had concluded.

Mr. MORGAN. Then it is the fact, in a parliamentary sense, if the Senator from West Virginia was in order that puts me in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts raised the question and the Chair inquired of the Secretary, and the moment the Chair ascertained the fact the Chair announced that debate was not in order.

Mr. HOAR. I raised the point on my friend from West Virginia, but I did not raise it on my friend from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll-call will proceed.

The roll was called.

Mr. BLAIR. Has a quorum voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL. That question can not be asked.

Mr. BLAIR. I have a right to vote if my vote is necessary to make a quorum. I vote "yea."

Mr. ALLISON. I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON], but if my vote is necessary to make a quorum I am authorized to vote.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Blair,	George,	Miller of Cal.,	Vest,
Call,	Harris,	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Harrison,	Pugh,	Walker,
Coke,	Hoar,	Rollins,	Williams.
Davis of Ill.,	Jackson,	Slater,	
Farley,	Jones of Nevada,	Tabor,	
Frye,	Kellogg,	Vance,	

NAYS—19.

Aldrich,	Conger,	Hawley,	Platt,
Anthony,	Davis of W. Va.,	Ingalls,	Plumb,
Bayard,	Dawes,	Logan,	Sewell,
Camden,	Gorman,	Miller of N. Y.,	Windom.
Cameron of Wis.,	Groome,	Morrill,	

ABSENT—32.

Allison,	Ferry,	Jones of Florida,	Mitchell,
Barrow,	Garland,	Lamar,	Pendleton,
Beck,	Grover,	Lapham,	Ransom,
Brown,	Hale,	McDill,	Saulsbury,
Butler,	Hampton,	McMillan,	Saunders,
Cameron of Pa.,	Hill,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Edmunds,	Johnston,	Mahone,	Sherman,
Fair,	Jonas,	Maxey,	Van Wyck.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I offer an amendment to supply an omission in the bill. The amendment was agreed to by the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island will be reported.

The ACTING SECRETARY. After line 296 it is proposed to insert:

Soda, silicate of, or other alkaline silicate, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. This is an omission from the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it on the free-list now?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the rate proposed is the same exactly as the present law. It was left out of the bill by mistake.

Mr. COCKRELL. Has it been printed in any of the prints?

Mr. ALDRICH. It has not been printed. If it had been it would not have been left out of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it possible that the Finance Committee omitted this article entirely?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Finance Committee are in favor of this amendment and have authorized me to offer it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it possible that in all their preparations and committals and arrangements this article escaped them?

Mr. ALDRICH. This is the first time I have had an opportunity to offer the amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think it ought to be on the free-list if the Finance Committee could not find it in the course of three months.

Mr. ALDRICH. We found it some time ago, and the committee instructed me to offer the amendment. This is the first opportunity I have had to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In line 794, to define what is meant by "fence-wire," and to prevent any evasions or frauds upon the revenue, I move after the word "except" to insert the words "Bessemer-steel barbed," so as to read:

Except Bessemer-steel barbed fence-wire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Rhode Island that he proposes to amend an amendment already inserted as in Committee of the Whole and agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I raise the point of order on it, then.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I move to insert the words after "wire."

Mr. PLUMB. Let the amendment be reported.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator may put additional words in anywhere he likes if he gets a majority to sustain him.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Chair to say that I can not move to insert additional words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question about the right of the Senator to propose an amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I do propose. I propose to add words to something that has been put in.

Mr. COCKRELL. That can not be done. I raise the point of order on that. I do hope the Senator from Rhode Island will let us have a vote and not delay action on this question.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am very desirous to have a vote upon this amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have gone over all this and adopted it. Let it stand.

Mr. PLUMB. I call for the reading of the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am waiting for the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. ALDRICH. My amendment as originally offered was to insert the words "Bessemer-steel barbed" after "except." Does the Chair rule that not in order? I am not clear about the Chair's ruling.

Mr. PLUMB. Let the Secretary report the amendment.

The ACTING SECRETARY. After the word "except" it is proposed to insert "Bessemer-steel barbed," so as to read "except Bessemer-steel barbed fence-wire."

Mr. PLUMB. Will the Secretary state where the word "except" occurs?

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 794, page 36.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Read the connection.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

That on all of the kinds of iron or steel, or articles or manufactures of iron or steel, hereinbefore in this act enumerated, except Bessemer-steel barbed fence-wire, when galvanized or coated with any metal or alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatsoever, &c.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is an amendment to the amendment already agreed to. I raise the point of order on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I will move, after the word "wire," to insert the words "made of Bessemer steel and barbed;" so as to read, "except fence-wire made of Bessemer steel and barbed."

Mr. VOORHEES. Let it be read, so that we can know whether it raises the duty or lowers it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read as now modified.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

That on all of the kinds of iron or steel, or articles or manufactures of iron or steel, hereinbefore in this act enumerated, except fence-wire made of Bessemer steel and barbed, when galvanized or coated with any metal or alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatever, not including paints, there shall be paid (excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne-plates, and tinner-tin, &c.)—

Mr. COCKRELL. We have gone all over that. I thought the Senator from Ohio had taken a turn enough at this metal schedule and consumed valuable time enough. Now, the Senator from Rhode Island is repeating the same thing. I raise the point of order that this is an amendment to an amendment that was heretofore adopted, and that it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken. It simply modifies an amendment already agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I submitted to one point of order against the rule of the Senate. I do not think I can submit to this. I certainly have a right to insert words in an amendment already agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do, if the Chair decides that the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has so decided. The appeal is debatable.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator from Rhode Island decides to consume the time of the Senate in debating a point of order—

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not said that I intended to debate the point of order. I have asked for the decision of the Senate upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask for the yeas and nays. I should like to know whether the Senate will vote to insert it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision

of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? On which the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. INGALLS. May I ask to hear a statement of the case, having been out of the Chamber for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, in line 794, after the word "enumerated," inserted the words except fence-wire." It was agreed to in the Senate. After it was agreed to as an amendment made in Committee of the Whole the Senator from Rhode Island proposes to insert before the word "when" and after the word "wire"—

Mr. ALDRICH. A part of the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which is a continuation of the amendment as in Committee of the Whole, a modification of its meaning. The Secretary will report the language proposed to be inserted.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, after the word "wire," "made of Bessemer steel and barbed;" so as to read:

Except fence-wire made of Bessemer steel and barbed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that to be a modification of the amendment already agreed to, and therefore holds that it is not in order.

Mr. INGALLS. The Chair is plainly right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? and the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll having been called, the result was announced—yeas 30, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bayard,	Davis of W. Va.,	Ingalls,	Slater,
Beck,	Farley,	Jackson,	Vance,
Call,	George,	Kellogg,	Vest,
Camden,	Gorman,	Miller of Cal.,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Groome,	Morgan,	Walker,
Coke,	Harris,	Plumb,	Williams.
Conger,	Harrison,	Pugh,	
Davis of Ill.,	Hawley,	Sewell,	

NAYS—11.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Logan,	Rollins,
Anthony,	Frye,	Miller of N. Y.,	Tabor,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hoar,	Morrill,	

ABSENT—35.

Allison,	Garland,	Lamar,	Platt,
Barrow,	Grover,	Lapham,	Ransom,
Blair,	Hale,	McDill,	Saulsbury,
Brown,	Hampton,	McMillan,	Saunders,
Butler,	Hill,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Cameron of Pa.,	Johnston,	Mahone,	Sherman,
Edmunds,	Jones,	Maxey,	Van Wyck,
Fair,	Jones of Florida,	Mitchell,	Windom.
Ferry,	Jones of Nevada,	Pendleton,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The decision of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to test the sense of the Senate upon this question. After the word "when," in line 794, I move to insert "made of Bessemer steel and barbed and;" so as to read:

When made of Bessemer steel and barbed and.

Mr. COCKRELL. I raise a point of order on that. Let it be reported so that we will understand it exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as now proposed will be reported.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 794, after the word "when," it is proposed to insert "made of Bessemer steel and barbed and;" so as to read:

That on all of the kinds of iron or steel, or articles or manufactures of iron or steel, hereinbefore in this act enumerated, except fence-wire, when made of Bessemer steel and barbed and galvanized or coated with any metal or alloy, &c.

Mr. ALDRICH. I merely desire to test the sense of the Senate on this amendment, as I believe I have a right to have the words inserted.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator is persisting in his obstinate obstruction of this bill. This has been agreed to in Committee of the Whole; it has been agreed to in the Senate; and now the Senator is not satisfied with it, and he is determined to amend it and to resort to every possible subterfuge to the overriding of the plainest possible rules of the Senate and of the procedure here. I think this is remarkably strange. I think if the Senator wanted the bill passed he would not pursue such a course.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not occupied one-fifth part as much time as the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator has spoken ten words to my one.

Mr. ALDRICH. In pursuance of my constitutional right, which I propose to exercise while I hold a place on this floor, I ask the sense of the Senate upon the amendment I propose.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will decide the question of order.

Mr. BAYARD. I should like to know the effect of this amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island in connection with the amendment which I offered and which was withdrawn at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. Is it intended to affect the manufacture of what is commercially known as galvanized sheet-iron?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is not the question of order pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BAYARD. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether his amendment is intended to affect the manufacture commercially known as galvanized sheet-iron?

Mr. ALDRICH. It was not. It did not go to that extent.

Mr. BAYARD. I understand it does not refer to that. I desire to offer an amendment upon that point.

Mr. ALDRICH. It merely defines what shall be known as fence-wire. It is a definition of "fence-wire," to prevent other kinds of wire being imported under the general name of "fence-wire."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will dispose of the question of order. The Chair thinks the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island falls within the rule rightly, and the Chair will entertain the amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. It ought to be understood that the effect of this is to destroy the entire force of the exception inserted in line 794 after a long struggle, because in the first place it limits it to one kind of wire, wire of Bessemer steel. In the next place, it limits it to barbed wire, and the barb is an American patent; consequently none of it can be imported. So that the effect will be, when we come to understand it, simply to undo all that has been heretofore done in the struggle to bring fence-wire within the lower rate of duty.

Mr. EDMUNDS. All that is entirely consistent with the ruling of the Chair, because nothing is clearer in parliamentary law than that a body has a right to make its own work just as inconsistent and out of tune as it pleases. The Chair is clearly right in his decision.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator from Vermont entirely misunderstood me if he thought I was addressing myself to the point of order. I was addressing myself to the effect of the amendment. The point of order had already been decided by the Chair.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I thought the Senator was referring to the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not my intention to change the action of the Senate in the slightest degree. I merely wanted to define "fence-wire" in accordance with what I understood to be the desire of the Senate. If we leave it in the condition it is now, I am afraid telegraph-wire and all kinds of wire will be imported as fence-wire. I want to exclude fence-wire, and I want to make such a definition of it as shall exclude it. All fence-wire is made of Bessemer steel. I am willing to leave the word "barbed" out. I will modify my amendment so as to say "made of Bessemer steel." It is all made of Bessemer steel, but will exclude iron wire made for telegraphic purposes.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island know that none of the imported wire is barbed?

Mr. ALDRICH. I modify my amendment by leaving off the words "and barbed." I have no desire to change the action of the Senate, but merely to define what shall be "fence-wire."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported as modified.

The ACTING SECRETARY. After the word "when," in line 794, it is proposed to insert "made of Bessemer steel;" so as to read:

That on all of the kinds of iron or steel, or articles or manufactures of iron or steel, hereinbefore in this act enumerated, except fence-wire, when made of Bessemer steel and galvanized or coated with any metal or alloy, &c.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think as the paragraph now stands it will be extremely difficult for any man who wishes to build a fence to get any wire in under it, because there is no wire made that is fence-wire only. It is all simply the wire of commerce used for a thousand purposes. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island will go far to help the men who wish to get cheap wire for their fences in without the payment of the duty imposed upon the other classes of wire. It is in favor of the people who wish to get wire to make fence, because I am confident that under the language as it now stands the customs authorities and the law authorities will hold that the wire of commerce, whether for fence or telegraph purposes or for a clothes-line or for belting or whatever it may be, is simply the wire of commerce capable of being used for all sorts of purposes. As it now stands I do not believe it is any advantage to the fence men at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

The amendment was rejected, there being on a division—ayes 17, noes 26.

Mr. HOAR. In line 631 I move to strike out the words "and one-half" before "cents;" so as to read:

Polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel, by whatever name designated, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment proposes to reduce the duty on what is known as Russia sheet-iron one-half of a cent a pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. HOAR. I suggested this amendment when the bill was up before, but I was met by the entire Finance Committee, and especially the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] also addressed the Senate, by the statement that the duty on Russia sheet-iron as fixed by the bill was about 32 per cent., and that that was a moderate duty in proportion to other similar duties, according to the principle of the action upon which those Senators went of a duty for revenue on all imports.

I insisted upon the authority of a very intimate personal friend of mine, for whose accuracy I was willing to vouch, that the duty the committee had got was over 50 per cent., and that the committee were misled by the fact that the Treasury statistics which accompany this bill and on which we have relied put the Russia rouble at 65 cents, whereas the Russia rouble was depreciated paper currency, being worth, as this gentleman certified, giving me the certificate of his own business company, being the Russian consul and a Russian importer, about 45 cents. But the Committee on Finance said very properly that they were not willing to accept against the certificate of the Treasury Department the statement of this unofficial gentleman so far as this question was concerned, whoever might vouch for him. Accordingly I abandoned my motion. But I went to the Treasury Department and the Treasury had a thorough investigation made and I have now the certificate of the Treasury showing that I was entirely right.

I wish to read two letters from Mr. French, and one from Mr. Elliott, the Statistician of the Treasury. There is a slight inaccuracy in the certificate of the consul, but on making further inquiry, Mr. French informs me that the consul's certificate is right. I will read the first and second letter of Mr. French and then Mr. Elliott's:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1883.

SIR: The calculation in the letter of the Russian consul on page 29 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1883, appears not to be quite correct, and the following statement is a correction of it:

Price 3.85 roubles per pood of thirty-six pounds at 65.8c. per rouble, equals \$2.53 per thirty-six pounds, or 7.03c. per pound. At 3c. a pound this duty would be 42.6 per cent. ad valorem.

Considering the fact that the duty is specific few invoices are accompanied by consular certificates to show the silver value of the rouble. Its purchasing value is in paper, and therefore the actual duty paid is about 42.6 per cent.

We failed to receive any satisfactory information from the customs officers at New York.

The above is the result of what we have been able to learn.

Very respectfully,

H. F. FRENCH, *Acting Secretary.*

P. S. The proclaimed value of the silver rouble is now 65.8c. and its actual value about 50 cents.

Hon. G. F. HOAR, *United States Senate.*

Now I come to Mr. French's second communication, dated the next day:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., February 9, 1883.

To Senator HOAR:

The actuary, Mr. Elliott, says the computation of the consul in RECORD of January 27 is correct on the data assumed.

H. F. FRENCH, *Acting Secretary.*

Then here is the statement handed me by Mr. Elliott, the actuary himself, who called on me:

RUSSIAN CREDIT-ROUBLE.

At commencement of 1879: At London, 23 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; United States equivalent, 48.10c. At commencement of 1880: At London, 25 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; United States equivalent, 51.07c. August, 1882: At London (equivalent), 47.40c. to 48.03c. Exchange on London (equivalent), 48.67c. to 48.92c.

January, 23 and 25, 1883: At London, United States equivalent, 46.50c. to 46.76c. Exchange on London, 48.03c.

Actual consular certificate in office of Fourth Auditor, Treasury Department, dated St. Petersburg, 19th August, 1882: Russian "paper rouble" given in exchange for United States gold coin at the rate 1 rouble for 48.38c.

So taking the proclaimed value of the article at 65, the committee have got this duty higher than they meant to themselves as 65 is in proportion to 47.40. In other words, they have got a duty of over 42 per cent. thinking they had a duty of about 32 per cent. They have got a duty of about 25 per cent. higher than they meant. My motion is to reduce it one-fifth, or 20 per cent.; to strike out the "one-half" where the duty is fixed at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, which leaves it at 2 cents per pound, which is a duty of about 35 per cent., or 3 per cent. higher than the committee intended to make it.

I will hand these statements to the Secretary, and if any member of the Finance Committee who objected to the amendment before, the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Delaware, would like to look at the calculations before they act upon it, I will let the motion stand until a later hour, or until the morning if we do not finish the bill to-night. I have no desire to press this unless I can satisfy the committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I do not know but that the Senate will be disposed to do in this case what it has done in very many other cases affecting the interests of my State. I have given some attention to this question, and in my judgment the rate proposed in the bill is fully as low as it ought to be and is not a sufficient protection to that industry. Why it is that the Senator from Massachusetts appears so anxious to attack this industry I can not understand, unless it be from motives which must control the action of certain Senators on this side of the Chamber, as it appears to me, in reducing tariff rates to so great an extent as utterly to destroy many of the leading industries of this country.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will permit me, if he desires to know my motive, it is that this is an article which never has been made, which is not now made, and never will be made in this country. There is a cheap imitation which will pass muster (the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] exhibited it the other day) for the time being, but when exposed to our climate, especially where there is any salt air, as on steamboats or vessels, is destroyed very quickly.

The secret of making Russia sheet-iron is not known. It is made in a limited quantity here. Although parties have been trying to make it for over twenty years under this high duty, there is but one concern in this country that makes it now. It is a concern in two places, in Pittsburgh and in Philadelphia, with the same name and the same agent. It is a very great necessity for a great many classes of buyers in my State.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I have a sufficient knowledge of the facts to justify me in respectfully denying what the Senator from Massachusetts says as a matter of fact. I say that the American producers of planished iron are to-day producing just as good iron as ever has been made or can be made in Russia or elsewhere. The use of this iron for the different purposes to which it is applied in this country ought to demonstrate that fact to the satisfaction of any American citizen at least. A very much larger proportion of this iron is used in this country and manufactured in this country than is obtained by importation from abroad. It is very largely used as covers for locomotives, and I am told that locomotives made in the city of Philadelphia are covered with this iron and sent to Russia, the country from which the Senator claims that this superior article is imported. I submit that even if the figures presented by the Senator are correct, the production is not so great, it being a peculiar industry requiring very great skill, requiring in this country the payment of very high wages as compared with those in Russia—more than twice as much; I think three times as much. I have before me a statement of the wages in Russia, and I find they run from 33 to 56 cents a day.

It is true that there are but two establishments in this country; one of them is in Philadelphia and one in Pittsburgh. It may be true that no other concerns have yet engaged in that industry, and I presume none will if the Congress of the United States sees fit to reduce the present duty which, even if it be 42 per cent. as is claimed, is not too much to protect it properly.

I have in my possession, but have mislaid it in some way or other, a circular from a very prominent concern in Boston in which they state explicitly that the American iron is the equal of Russia iron, and that they sell it in the markets as easily as the Russian. I have here samples of this iron. If any Senator desires to look at them and compare the two productions, he may possibly form his judgment from an inspection of them. Here is one kind produced in this country, and there is the other.

Mr. HOAR. They have not been used.

Mr. MITCHELL. But the American stands the wear and tear of storms as well as the Russian.

Mr. HOAR. That is not my information.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to be at least the judgment of a very large number of people engaged in the business who require this kind of iron in this country. I presume the Senator may deny the statement I made, that a larger proportion of American manufactured iron is used in this country than that which comes from abroad.

I have said all I desire to say. I trust the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. The whole matter is this: The Finance Committee and the Tariff Commission meant to impose a duty on this article of 32 per cent. They made a mistake, and have got it nearly 45 per cent.—over 42 per cent. I have shown conclusively the error by the circular of the Treasury Department itself. My amendment does not reduce it quite to the point where the committee meant to fix it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLISON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. MITCHELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. WALKER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] are paired, but as the Senator from Indiana would have voted "yea," the Senator from Kansas has voted.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JONAS] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON].

Mr. GROOME. I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 17; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Beck,
Blair,
Call,
Cockrell,
Coke,
Davis of Ill.,

Dawes,
George,
Harris,
Hoar,
Ingalls,
Jackson,

Kellogg,
Miller of Cal.,
Morgan,
Plumb,
Rollins,
Slaters,

Tabor,
Vest,
Walker,
Williams.

NAYS—17.

Aldrich, Anthony, Bayard, Camden, Cameron of Wis.,	Conger, Davis of W. Va., Farley, Frye, Gorman,	Harrison, Hawley, Jones of Nevada, McMillan, Morrill,	Sewell, Windom.
--	--	---	--------------------

ABSENT—37.

Allison, Barrow, Brown, Butler, Cameron of Pa., Edmunds, Fair, Ferry, Garland, Groome,	Grover, Hale, Hampton, Hill, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Florida, Lamar, Lapham, Logan,	McDill, McPherson, Mahone, Maxey, Miller of N. Y., Mitchell, Pendleton, Platt, Pugh, Ransom,	Saulsbury, Saunders, Sawyer, Sherman, Vance, Van Wyck, Voorhees.
---	--	---	--

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. In line 467 the Senate refused to concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole making the tariff on glass bottles $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. As this is an article on which I should like to have a specific duty instead of an ad valorem, I move to amend by striking out "30 per cent. ad valorem," in line 467, and inserting " $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound;" so as to read:

Green and colored glass bottles, vials, demijohns, and carboys (covered or uncovered), pickle or preserve jars, and other plain, molded, or pressed green and colored bottle-glass, not cut, engraved, or painted, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SEWELL. I will state that the vote on this question was a tie before on $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents and I trust the Senate will now agree to $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. COCKRELL. It has been stated here, it is not printed in the RECORD and I do not know how the bill has been printed, that this amendment was agreed to as in Committee of the Whole. I should like to inquire as to that.

Mr. SEWELL. The amendment fixing $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound was agreed to in Committee of the Whole and disagreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It was a tie vote upon $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents so that the text of the bill remains as it was. The amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was not concurred in by the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. As this is renewing in the Senate an amendment which was made as in Committee of the Whole and not agreed to in the Senate, I raise the point of order on it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is fixing a different rate, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think the point of order made by my friend from Missouri is well taken.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator from Tennessee will wait a moment he will see that I make no point of order if the Senator from New Jersey offers his amendment at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents. I thought he offered it at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand the facts as the Senator now states them.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. I will inquire of the Senator from New Jersey what ad valorem a duty of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound is equivalent to?

Mr. SEWELL. I should think it would be equivalent to about 30 per cent. The present law is 35 per cent. This measure takes off the charges on the packages, and the rate is reduced in the bill to 30 per cent.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. If it is equivalent to 30 per cent., what is the object of changing it?

Mr. SEWELL. Because we want a specific duty to avoid undervaluation. That is the cause really.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. We have heard a great deal about that. I am informed that $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound would be equivalent to a much larger ad valorem duty than 30 per cent.

Mr. BECK. It is equal to 100 per cent., and it was so stated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] the other day.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. That is the objection I have to it.

Mr. SEWELL. I do not wish to go over this question and I do not wish to raise any debate. The statement of the manufacturers is entirely different; $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents is one-third of the value of the product here.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GROOME (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. GORMAN (when Mr. MCPHERSON's name was called). I was requested to announce the pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JONAS]. The Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS].

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New York [Mr. LAPHAM] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM].

Mr. HALE. I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PENDLETON].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Aldrich, Anthony, Beck, Camden, Conger, Dawes,	Edmunds, Frye, Harrison, Hawley, Hoar, Kellogg,	Logan, McDill, McMillan, Miller of Cal., Morrill, Platt,	Plumb, Rollins, Sewell, Windom.
---	--	---	--

NAYS—18.

Bayard, Call, Cameron of Wis., Cockrell, Coke,	Davis of Ill., Davis of W. Va., Farley, George, Gorman,	Harris, Ingalls, Jackson, Morgan, Slaters,	Vest, Walker, Williams.
--	---	--	-------------------------------

ABSENT—36.

Allison, Barrow, Blair, Brown, Butler, Cameron of Pa., Fair, Ferry, Garland,	Groome, Grover, Hale, Hampton, Hill, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada,	Lamar, Lapham, McPherson, Mahone, Maxey, Miller of N. Y., Mitchell, Pendleton, Pugh,	Ransom, Saulsbury, Saunders, Sawyer, Sherman, Tabor, Vance, Van Wyck, Voorhees.
--	--	--	---

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECK. I move to reconsider the vote just taken; and pending that I move that the Senate do now adjourn. I do not want to increase taxation when those who do not wish to increase it are absent, and we have got hardly a quorum of unpaired Senators.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the Senator from Kentucky withdraw the motion for an instant?

Mr. BECK. Certainly.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7482) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (S. 2264) to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to establish them as post-roads; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 337) to provide for admission free of duty of articles intended for a special exhibition of machinery, tools, implements, apparatus, &c., for the generation and application of electricity, to be held at Philadelphia by the Franklin Institute.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. President, it is now nearly 2 o'clock in the morning. I am the father of the Senate, and you, sir, are the boss of it. Our boys have behaved pretty well to-day, and I propose that we give them a bit of a holiday. I move that when the Senate adjourn it be to meet at 12 o'clock on Tuesday; or if the Senator from Kentucky will withdraw the motion I will move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Kentucky accept the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BECK. I accept anything. I merely want to get away from here to-night.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is moved that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m. Tuesday morning) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 19, 1883.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

The Journal of Saturday last was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HISCOCK, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 7595) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and with the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLIN. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill. The SPEAKER. They will be reserved.

Mr. HISCOCK. I give notice that I shall ask the House to consider this bill to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill which has been recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and to give notice that when the sundry civil bill shall have been taken up for consideration I will move it as an amendment to that bill.

There was no objection; and it was so ordered.

The proposed amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs to the sundry civil bill is as follows:

That the Secretary of the Navy shall cause to be laid out in convenient lots for building and commercial purposes with convenient streets, avenues, and wharves in substantial accord with the recommendations and report made and submitted by Commodore John H. Upshur, all that land in the Wallabout Bay, in the State of New York, included within the present limits of the Brooklyn navy-yard and the United States naval hospital grounds which is bounded and described as follows:

Parcel A, containing about thirty-three and one-quarter acres, beginning at the northwest corner of Washington and Flushing avenues; thence westerly along the line of Flushing avenue 848 feet; thence northerly along a line parallel to the line of Washington avenue to the north line of the property of the United States, being about 1,900 feet; thence easterly along the line of the property of the United States to Washington avenue, being about 940 feet; thence along the line of Washington avenue to the point of beginning.

Parcel B, containing about twenty-four and a half acres, beginning at the northeast corner of Washington and Flushing avenues; thence northerly along the line of Washington avenue to the northerly line of the property of the United States fronting on Kent-avenue basin; thence easterly along the line of the property of the United States parallel with Kent-avenue basin to the easterly line of Hewes street extended; thence southwesterly along the easterly line of Hewes street extended about one hundred and fifty feet; thence westerly on a line parallel to the course of Flushing avenue west of Ryerson street to a point five hundred and twenty feet from Washington avenue; thence southerly to Flushing avenue, seven hundred feet; thence westerly along the line of Flushing avenue, five hundred and twenty feet, to the place of beginning.

And the Secretary shall cause the said lots, when so laid out as aforesaid, to be appraised by three appraisers of experience and competent knowledge, to be selected by him, and after said appraisal he shall advertise the same for sale at public auction, in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, either at one sale or at several different sales, at not less than the appraised value of each, subject to such reservations and limitations as to use as he may deem best; and he is hereby authorized and empowered to make and execute, in the name of the United States, deeds of such lots to the purchasers, upon the payment of the purchase-money in full; and at such sale or sales he may give to the purchasers of any single lot the election to take at the same price per square foot any number of unsold lots within the same block or square. After deducting the cost of all surveys, plans, appraisal, advertisements, and sale he shall pay or cause to be paid into the Treasury of the United States the proceeds of said sale: *Provided*, That the city of Brooklyn may purchase, at not less than the appraised value thereof, so much of the northerly end of parcel A, hereinbefore described, as said city may desire for market purposes, the southerly line of said purchase to extend from Washington avenue westerly to the westerly line of said parcel, and in a line parallel to Flushing avenue.

ELECTION CONTEST—COOK VS. CUTTS.

Mr. BELTZHOVER, from the Committee on Elections, submitted a report in the contested-election case of Cook vs. Cutts, sixth Congressional district of Iowa, accompanied by the following resolutions:

Resolved, That M. E. Cutts was not elected as a Representative from the sixth Congressional district of Iowa, and is not entitled to a seat on the floor of this House.

Resolved, That John C. Cook was duly elected as a Representative from the sixth district of Iowa, and is entitled to a seat on the floor of this House.

Mr. MILLER. The minority of the Committee on Elections ask leave to submit their views to be printed with the report of the majority.

The SPEAKER. Permission will be granted.

The report was ordered to be printed, and laid over for the present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UPSON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order being called for, this being Monday, the first business in order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, also resolutions calling for executive information for reference and printing to their appropriate committees. Under this call resolutions and memorials of State and Territorial Legislatures are in order for reference to their appropriate committees.

FRANK M. SANFORD.

Mr. WHEELER introduced a bill (H. R. 7596) for the relief of Frank M. Sanford; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COLORADO MINING AND INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. BELFORD introduced a bill (H. R. 7597) to admit free of duty articles intended for the national mining and industrial exposition to be held at Denver, in the State of Colorado, during the year 1883; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN F. TUTTLE.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (H. R. 7598) granting a pension to John F. Tuttle; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ARREARS OF PENSIONS.

Mr. PEIRCE presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the

State of Indiana in favor of extending the time for filing claims for arrears of pension; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay.

At the conclusion of the call of States, Mr. PEIRCE asked and obtained consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the act of Congress providing for the payment of arrears of pension expired by limitation before many entitled to make just claims thereunder had availed themselves of its provisions; and

Whereas many worthy and deserving soldiers have been thereby deprived of the benefits to which they are entitled: Therefore,

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein), That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to favor the passage of a law giving reasonable time for disabled soldiers or their representatives to file in the proper Department their claims for relief under said act.

THOMAS HANNA,
President of Senate.
A. J. KELLEY,
Secretary of Senate.

REDUCTION OF REVENUE.

Mr. ANDERSON introduced a bill (H. R. 7599) to reduce the revenue upon all importations into the United States; which was read a first and second time.

The question was upon referring the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask that the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The reading of the bill on this call will not take it into the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON. Very well; let it be read for the information of the House.

The bill was read at length, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

D. S. CAGE.

Mr. ELLIS introduced a bill (H. R. 7600) for the relief of D. S. Cage and other citizens of Louisiana; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

NAVIGATION OF MINNESOTA RIVER.

Mr. STRAIT presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, praying that Big Stone Lake and the Bois de Sioux River be embraced in the reservoir system, so that the excess of water may be so utilized as to render the Minnesota River navigable; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SANDWICH ISLAND SUGAR.

Mr. BELMONT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the House all correspondence between officers of the Treasury Department or between those officers and any other person or persons, and all orders or decisions by the Department respecting the execution of so much of the Hawaiian treaty of 1875 and the law of 1876 to enforce the same, as relates to Sandwich Island sugar.

CATHARINE SMITH.

Mr. SCOVILLE introduced a bill (H. R. 7601) for the relief of Catharine Smith; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS IN THE TREASURY.

Mr. SKINNER introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 351) providing for an equitable distribution of surplus money in the United States Treasury among the several States for maintenance of schools and payment of debts; which was read a first and second time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SKINNER. No; it relates to the reduction of the revenue and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. It relates to an expenditure of the revenue for the maintenance of schools, &c., and the Chair thinks it should go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SKINNER. Very well.

The joint resolution was accordingly referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. COX, of New York, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Resolved, That the President of the United States, if not incompatible with the public service, communicate to this House all the correspondence in relation to the treatment of Jews in Russia which has taken place since the last communication on that subject to this House between the Government of the United States and that of Russia.

REPORTS FROM REVENUE-CUTTERS.

Mr. COX, of New York, also submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish, as soon as convenient, to the Speaker of this House all documents in the possession of his Department containing observations on glaciation, birds, natural history, and the medical notes made upon cruises of revenue-cutters in the year 1881.

MILITARY ACADEMY CADETS.

Mr. McCOOK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform this House of the number of vacancies that have existed at the United States Military Academy each year during the five years last past preceding July 1, 1883, the number of candidates appointed to fill such vacancies, the number admitted to the corps of cadets, the number of cadets graduated each year, and the number of cadets found deficient.

ELLEN HORGAN.

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York, introduced a bill (H. R. 7602) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Horgan; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SMUGGLING BY NAVAL OFFICERS.

Mr. FLOWER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to inform this House whether there have been reported by the customs officers any attempts to smuggle goods by officers of the Navy or to defraud the Government of any duties upon imported goods within the last ten years; and, if so, the number of such instances.

LAWS OF UNITED STATES FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. VAN HORN introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 352) to provide for an increased supply of the laws of the United States for the Treasury Department and its officers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING REPORT OF CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER.

Mr. VAN HORN introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 353) authorizing the printing and binding of additional copies of the report of the Chief Signal Officer; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN H. POYNTER.

Mr. BURROWS, of Missouri, introduced a bill (H. R. 7603) for the relief of John H. Poynter; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS A. BAIRD.

Mr. YOUNG submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to Francis A. Baird, out of the contingent fund of the House, a sum equal to the difference between the compensation received by him as laborer and that of electrician, from the 24th day of February, 1882, to the 24th day of February, 1883.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF ALEXANDER H. BROWN.

Mr. McCLURE (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 7604) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander H. Brown, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing Congress relative to increase of pensions in certain cases; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, and, by consent subsequently obtained, ordered to be printed in the RECORD: Joint resolution memorializing Congress relative to increase of pensions in certain cases.

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate a bill known as House bill No. 1410, designed to increase the pensions of soldiers having lost in the line of duty one arm, one hand, one leg, or one foot, as amended: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That we fully approve the contents of said bill and recommend its passage by Congress at an early date as amended by said committee; and a copy of this resolution be by the governor forwarded to the members of the House and Senate in Congress from Ohio.

O. J. HODGE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. A. HERR,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Adopted February 1, 1883.

DAVID C. VOSBINDER.

Mr. GEDDES introduced a bill (H. R. 7605) granting an increase of pension to David C. Vosbinder; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DONATION OF CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. GEDDES also introduced a bill (H. R. 7606) granting two condemned cannon to Hughs Post, Nashville, Ohio; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN E. WAREHAM.

Mr. GEDDES also introduced a bill (H. R. 7607) granting a pension to John E. Wareham; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGES TO NAVAL VESSELS.

Mr. BEACH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be instructed to report to this House the number of vessels belonging to the Navy which have been materially dam-

aged at sea, or have collided with other vessels, or have been run aground in port or elsewhere in each year during the last ten years, together with a statement of the number of naval vessels in commission for each year of such period.

CHIEF ENGINEER MELVILLE.

Mr. WARD introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 354) tendering the thanks of Congress to and conferring additional rank on Chief Engineer George W. Melville, United States Navy, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE GREAT KANAWHA.

Mr. O'NEILL introduced a bill (H. R. 7608) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Great Kanawha River, and to prescribe the dimensions of the same; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SIDNEY KEMPTON.

Mr. BELTZHOVER introduced a bill (H. R. 7609) granting a pension to Sidney Kempton; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN KUNKEL.

Mr. BELTZHOVER also introduced a bill (H. R. 7610) for the relief of John Kunkel; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CORRESPONDENCE OF SECRETARY OF WAR AND GENERAL HAZEN.

Mr. BELTZHOVER also submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to communicate to the House all correspondence which has passed between him, the said Secretary of War, and General William B. Hazen, the Chief Signal Officer, during the month of February, 1883.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. BINGHAM introduced a bill (H. R. 7611) to adjust the salaries of postmasters; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

PRETENDED POST-OFFICES.

Mr. BINGHAM also introduced a bill (H. R. 7612) to amend section 3829 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. RICHARDSON, of South Carolina, submitted a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina relative to Federal aid for public schools; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was subsequently ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and is as follows:

Concurrent resolution relative to Federal aid for public schools, passed by the General Assembly of South Carolina at the regular session commencing November 28, 1882.

Whereas it is the desire of the people of the State of South Carolina to promote the education of all people who inhabit her territory, which desire is evidenced by the fact that those who now administer the affairs of the State have amended the constitution so that an annual tax of 2 mills upon the taxable property and a poll-tax of \$1 per head is levied for the support of the public schools, which are opened to all classes; and

Whereas it is earnestly desired that the public schools of the State may be rendered productive of still greater good to those classes who can not be educated without aid: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of South Carolina (the house of representatives concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, urged to use all of their endeavors to obtain Federal aid for the promotion of the public schools of this and our sister States, according to the ratio of illiteracy existing in the States.

Resolved further, That the clerks of the senate and house of representatives do furnish copies of this resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Congress for presentation to said body.

T. STOBO FARROW,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN T. SLOAN,
Clerk House of Representatives.

ELI B. PARKER.

Mr. JOYCE introduced a bill (H. R. 7613) granting a pension to Eli B. Parker; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS HEATH.

Mr. DEZENDORF introduced a bill (H. R. 7614) for the payment of bounty to Thomas Heath; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES FOREDICE.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (H. R. 7615) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Foredice; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JACOB D. GEHO.

Mr. WILSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 7616) granting a pension

to Jacob D. Geho; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

IRA J. J. TURNEY.

Mr. GUENTHER introduced a bill (H. R. 7617) granting a pension to Ira J. J. Turney; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

NATURALIZATION.

Mr. DEUSTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7618) to amend section 2172 of the Revised Statutes, in relation to naturalization; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

E. BROGLIN.

Mr. HOUK introduced a bill (H. R. 7619) for the relief of E. Broglin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM G. SMITH.

Mr. PEELE introduced a bill (H. R. 7620) granting an increase of pension to William G. Smith; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SCHOOL AFFAIRS IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. SHERWIN (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 7621) to provide for the appointment and support of officers charged with the supervision of school affairs in the Territories of the United States, excepting the Indian Territory and the Territory of Alaska; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

MINERVA A. ROSS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois, introduced a bill (H. R. 7622) granting a pension to Minerva A. Ross; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LOUISVILLE SOUTHERN EXPOSITION.

Mr. WILLIS introduced a bill (H. R. 7623) relative to the Southern exposition to be held in the city of Louisville, State of Kentucky, in the year 1883; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

SAINT VINCENT A PORT OF ENTRY.

Mr. DUNNELL presented memorial of the Legislature of Maine, asking that Saint Vincent be made a port of entry. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CUTHBERT WHITE.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (H. R. 7624) for the relief of Cuthbert White; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

UNEARNED LAND GRANTS.

Mr. BERRY also presented a joint resolution of the California Legislature, asking that all unearned land grants to railroads be restored to the public domain; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Subsequently the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and is as follows:

Assembly concurrent resolution No. 13.

Passed the assembly January 23, A. D. 1883.

M. C. HALEY,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Passed the senate February 6, 1883.

EDWIN F. SMITH,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was received by the governor this 8th day of February, A. D. 1883.

W. W. MORELAND,
Private Secretary of the Governor.

CHAPTER —.—Assembly concurrent resolution No. 13.

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to use their influence and utmost endeavors in Congress to procure such legislation as may be necessary to restore to the Government all the public lands hitherto withdrawn from settlement or sale for the benefit of railroads in this State in all cases where such lands have not been earned by the roads for which such withdrawals were made.

Resolved, That his excellency the governor cause a copy of these resolutions to be immediately forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

H. M. LA RUE,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN DAGGETT,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

THOS. L. THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

SETTING ASIDE PATENTS, ETC.

Mr. BERRY also presented a joint resolution of the California Legislature requesting the Attorney-General be authorized and requested to commence suits to set aside certain patents held by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was subsequently ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and is as follows:

Assembly concurrent resolution No. 15.

Passed the assembly January 23, A. D. 1883.

M. C. HALEY,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Passed the senate February 6, A. D. 1883.

EDWIN F. SMITH,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was received by the governor this 8th day of February, A. D. 1883.

W. W. MORELAND,
Private Secretary of the Governor.

CHAPTER —.—Assembly concurrent resolution No. 15, concerning litigation to determine the title to Mussel Slough lands in Tulare and Fresno Counties, California.

Whereas a controversy exists between the Southern Pacific Railroad Company and the settlers of the Mussel Slough district, in Tulare and Fresno Counties, as to the title to the odd-numbered sections of land claimed by the railroad company, but settled upon, improved, held, and made valuable by the occupants; and

Whereas this controversy has already eventuated in a tragedy in which eight citizens lost their lives and in the imprisonment of five men believed by the great majority of the people to be innocent of crime; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the State that the question of title over which this bloody tragedy occurred shall be settled for all time; and

Whereas the settlers aforesaid claim that the said railroad company never had authority to build its road and never was granted land to aid in its construction on its present line or within more than one hundred miles from where this tragedy occurred; and

Whereas the said settlers insist that the patents issued by the Federal Government to the said railroad company are therefore voidable because of error or fraud in their procurement; and

Whereas the said settlers assert that the withdrawal of these lands from settlement was in violation of law, and that they were thereby denied the right to file in the Land Office their pre-emption and homestead claims, and are also denied the right to attack in their own names the patents which they allege should belong to them, but which are held by said railroad company; and

Whereas one of the highest duties devolving upon a government is the protection of its citizens in all their rights; and

Whereas the right to home and fireside is the dearest of all rights of man, as it tends to bind closer the ties of family, upon which States are built and the welfare and happiness of the people thereof depend; and

Whereas when the citizen of the State is unable to institute in the courts proceedings for his own protection it is the duty of the State to see to it that the barred door of justice be unlocked to his complaint in order that it may be heard upon its merits: Therefore,

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That, in the name of the State of California, the Attorney-General of the United States be requested to at once authorize the attorney-general of the State of California to commence proceedings in the name of the Federal Government to set aside the patents held for these lands by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, to the end that the respective rights of the people who settled upon and improved these lands by virtue of and under the laws of the United States, as well as of the said railroad company, may be litigated, tried, and determined.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress, including our Congressmen-elect, be requested to use all honorable means, either by personal application or by action of Congress, to secure on the part of the Attorney-General of the United States compliance with these resolutions.

Resolved, That his excellency the governor of the State of California be requested to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Attorney-General of the United States, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and Congressmen-elect.

H. M. LA RUE,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN DAGGETT,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

THOS. L. THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

CHINESE RESTRICTION LAW.

Mr. BERRY also presented joint resolution of the California Legislature, protesting against the construction of the Chinese restriction law which was made by the Attorney-General; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was subsequently ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and is as follows:

Assembly concurrent resolution No. 1.

Passed the assembly January 19, A. D. 1883.

M. C. HALEY,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Passed the senate February 6, A. D. 1883.

EDWIN F. SMITH,
Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution was received by the governor this 9th day of February, A. D. 1883.

W. M. MORELAND,
Private Secretary of the Governor.

CHAPTER —.—Assembly concurrent resolution No. 1, relative to the law restricting Chinese immigration and its construction by officers of the General Government.

Whereas by the late decisions of officers of the General Government, the spirit and intent of the law restricting Chinese immigration have been violated and set aside, thereby permitting Chinese subjects to enter the United States for the purpose, apparently, of passing through the country on their way to China, but there being nothing to prevent their stopping while in transit, the objects of the law will be defeated and our State be again subject to a renewed invasion by that undesirable class of people: Therefore,

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to enter a protest upon the part of the State of California against such construction of the said law; and also request them to do all acts necessary to make such additional provisions to said bill which will prevent the attempted abrogation of the spirit and intent of said law.

Be it further resolved, That the governor of this State be, and he is hereby, re-

quested to transmit a copy of the above preamble and resolution and forward the same to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California.

H. M. LA RUE,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN DAGGETT,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
[SEAL]

THOS. L. THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

PAYMENT OF VOLUNTEERS, INDIAN WAR 1877-'78.

Mr. AINSLIE presented the memorial of the Legislative Assembly of Idaho Territory, asking that the volunteers in the Indian war of 1877-'78 be paid for their services; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

GEORGE KENNEDY.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (H. R. 7625) for the relief of George Kennedy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

NICARAGUA CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. GEORGE presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon in favor of the incorporation of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Some time subsequently, by unanimous consent, the said memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 5.

Whereas a bill for the incorporation of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua has been favorably reported by the Committees on Foreign Affairs of the United States Senate and House of Representatives at the last session of Congress, and has been made the "order of the day" on the second Monday in December next in the Senate; and

Whereas the Nicaragua Inter-oceanic Canal will be of great benefit to the producers and merchants of the Pacific coast, as well as of great commercial and political advantage to our country: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Legislature of Oregon, by concurrent resolution of its senate and assembly, respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the necessity for immediate and favorable action upon the act incorporating the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, in order that this beneficent work may be promptly commenced and carried to a successful conclusion, securing to our country an American inter-oceanic canal under American control.

Adopted in the senate September 21, 1882.

W. J. McCONNELL,
President of the Senate.

Adopted in the house September 22, 1882.

GEO. W. McBRIDE,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
Office of the Secretary of State, Salem, January 22, 1883.

I, R. P. Earhart, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the great seal thereof; that the foregoing transcript of the senate concurrent resolution No. 5 has been by me compared with the original copy of the said senate concurrent resolution No. 5 now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof, and the whole of said original resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the great seal of the State of Oregon. Done at the capitol at Salem, Oregon, this 22d day of January, A. D. 1883.

[SEAL.]

R. P. EARHART,
Secretary of State.

COMPULSORY PILOTAGE.

Mr. LADD presented joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Maine, asking relief from compulsory pilotage, &c.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is now concluded.

UNIVERSAL PEACE.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit a memorial of a committee representing the Society of Friends for New England, upon the subject of universal peace, asking the establishment of an international system of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between nations, with the request that it be ordered to be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman for unanimous consent.

There was no objection, and the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, a committee under appointment of and representing the Society of Friends for New England, upon the subject of universal peace, desire respectfully to convey to your honorable body the expression of our warm approval of the joint resolution recently introduced to the Senate by Senator GEORGE F. HOAR, of Massachusetts, authorizing and directing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with all the civilized powers which may consent, for the establishment of an international system whereby matters in dispute between their respective governments may be adjusted by arbitration and without recourse to war.

We would earnestly solicit the favorable attention of Congress to this important question, and also entreat its active influence for the accomplishment of an end

with which we believe the welfare of nations and the progress of Christian civilization are closely connected.

TIMOTHY B. HUSSEY, of Maine.
GEORGE RICHARDSON, of Maine.
GERTRUDE W. CARTLAND, of Massachusetts.
RACHAEL S. HOWLAND, of New Bedford, Mass.
CHARLES C. VARNEY, of East Parsonsfield, Me.
JOSEPH H. ATWATER, of Providence, R. I.
GEORGE HUSSEY GIFFORD, of Rhode Island.
SAMUEL R. BUFFINTON, of Massachusetts.
WILLIAM JACOB, of Massachusetts.
SYBIL NARCISSE JACOB, of Massachusetts.
HENRY T. WOOD, of Massachusetts.

ARREARAGES OF PENSIONS.

Mr. PEELE. During the call of the States and Territories for the introduction of bills, I submitted resolutions of the State of Indiana with reference to the time in which to file applications for pensions under the arrearages act with the request that it be printed in the RECORD. Since the unanimous consent has been given to have printed a copy of the same resolution submitted by my colleague [Mr. PEIRCE], I will simply ask leave now to present the resolutions of the State and ask that they be appropriately referred.

There was no objection, and the said resolutions were referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay.

TAX ON COTTON-TIES.

Mr. MONEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the body of two petitions which I introduced this morning through the petition-box, from colored laborers in the cotton-fields of the South, protesting against the imposition of any increased tax upon cotton-ties and bands used in baling cotton; and ask that the same be also referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly. The petition is as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

The undersigned, colored laborers in the cotton-fields, and growers and planters of that great staple of the South, respectfully but earnestly protest against the imposition of any increased tax upon iron ties and bands used in baling cotton. They beg to represent that any increase of duty as is contemplated will be an immediate reduction of the proceeds they now receive from their labors, adding direct to the cost of sending their products to a market. They further beg to represent that the price of cotton has reached so low a figure that it barely affords a living margin above the cost of production, and that with any additional imposition by the Government they can not compete with the cheap labor of India and Egypt. In the lower Mississippi Valley the cotton crops for the past three years have been poor, and with the large production elsewhere the laborers and farmers have been made to suffer from lessened returns in the way of cotton and lower prices, all of which has reduced them to a condition of poverty and distress.

In face of these facts the laboring people, and especially the colored race, look to the Government for assistance and protection, and earnestly call upon Congress to do nothing that may entail upon them additional burdens.

ROBERT SMALLS.

Mr. DEZENDORF, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 7059, a bill (H. R. 7626) authorizing a reappraisal of the steam-transport boat Planter captured by Robert Smalls, and for a distribution of proceeds thereof; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CAPTAIN J. H. GILLIS.

Mr. DEZENDORF also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the joint resolution (H. Res. 128) tendering the thanks of Congress to Captain J. H. Gillis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

UNION METALLIC CARTRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. YOUNG, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Patents, reported back the bill (H. R. 7257) for the relief of the Union Metallic Cartridge Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SOLOMON K. RUGGLES.

Mr. FULKERSON, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back the bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Solomon K. Ruggles; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent to submit at this time, and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, certain resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange of Saint Louis with reference to the improvement of the Mississippi River and urging Congress to sustain the plans of the Mississippi River Commission in that direction.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

The resolutions are as follows:

MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE OF SAINT LOUIS,
Saint Louis, February 9, 1883.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of directors, held this day, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas the importance to the whole country of continuing the work of the improvement of the Mississippi River in the interest of cheap transportation is a matter of national interest: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri be, and is hereby, requested to adopt a joint resolution, instructing our Senators and requesting our Representatives in Congress to sustain the plans of the Mississippi River Commission, and to further request them to use their best endeavors to secure the appropriations necessary to carry out the recommendations of the commission for the next fiscal year.

Resolved, That the president and secretary of this exchange be, and are hereby, instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the governors and presiding officers of the Legislatures of all the States throughout the Mississippi Valley and to the boards of trade and similar organizations interested in the successful improvement of our Western water ways, and invite their co-operation in such action as will unite the influence and power of the States in the valley in support of the river commission, as the best means whereby cheap transportation by water can be obtained.

Respectfully submitted.

J. C. EWALD, President,
GEO. H. MORGAN, Secretary.

Attest:
Hon. J. FLOYD KING, of Louisiana.

JAMES A. WATKINS.

Mr. DAVIS, of Illinois, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7173) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant the use of certain lands at Fortress Monroe, Virginia, to James A. Watkins for the extension of his building; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIS, of Illinois, also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 6947, a bill (H. R. 7627) to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company to extend its road to a point on the lands of the United States at Fortress Monroe, Virginia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL BANK OF WEST GREENVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. ERMENROUT, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7587) changing the name of the First National Bank of West Greenville, Pennsylvania, to the First National Bank of Greenville, Pennsylvania; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE THAMES RIVER.

Mr. WASHBURN, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7115) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Thames River near New London, in the State of Connecticut; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ILLINOIS RIVER.

Mr. WASHBURN also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7148) to establish a railway bridge across the Illinois River, extending from a point within five miles of Columbiana, Greene County, to a point within five miles of Farrowtown, in Calhoun County, in the State of Illinois; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. WASHBURN also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7589) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the most accessible point within ten miles below and five miles above the city of Kansas City, Missouri; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

D. S. CAGE AND OTHERS.

Mr. ELLIS. I ask unanimous consent to have the documents presented with the bill which I introduced this morning for the relief of D. S. Cage and others, citizens of Louisiana, printed with the bill.

The SPEAKER. That is a very unusual request.

Mr. ELLIS. I have had it done before.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the papers will be ordered to be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

NATIONAL BANK OF WEST GREENVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate action the bill S. No. 2490. It merely strikes out the word "West" from the name of the First National Bank of West Greenville, owing to the fact that the same word has been stricken out from the name of the town since the organization of the bank. The bank being

about to reorganize desires that its name shall be the same as that of the town and the post-office. A similar bill has been unanimously recommended for passage by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. UPSON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for, which is in the nature of an objection.

Mr. MILLER. I understand the call for the regular order is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. UPSON] withdraw the call for the regular order?

Mr. UPSON. I do not.

LIGHT ON ROSMER SHOAL.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a petition for the establishment of a light on Rosmer Shoal, in the lower bay of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CONTESTED ELECTION—JONES VS. SHELLEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House testimony in the contested election case of Jones vs. Shelley; which was referred to the Committee on Elections, and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF DETROIT RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War to accompany papers in relation to the improvement of the Detroit River at Lime-Kiln Crossing; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

GAS FOR LIGHTING BEACONS AND BUOYS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to a House resolution of the 9th instant in regard to the cost of introducing gas for lighting beacons and buoys; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This being the third Monday—

Mr. BLANCHARD addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I desire to introduce a bill for reference.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman from Texas who called for the regular order withdrew the call in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas had no right to withdraw it in favor of any person.

Mr. BLANCHARD. He did withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is not in order.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman from Texas has withdrawn the call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked the gentleman from Texas whether he withdrew the call for the regular order, and he said he did not.

This being the third Monday of the month, and the call of States and Territories having been completed, motions may be made to suspend the rules, preference being given on the third Monday to committees.

The Committees on Public Expenditures and on Private Land Claims were called and did not offer motions to suspend the rules.

The Committee on the District of Columbia was called.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (H. Res. No. 337) to provide for admission free of duty of articles intended for a special exhibition of machinery, tools, implements, apparatus, &c., for the generation and application of electricity, to be held at Philadelphia by the Franklin Institute.

NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY OF WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. PEIRCE. I am instructed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to report back the bill (H. R. No. 7186) to incorporate The National Trust Company of Washington, District of Columbia, and to move that the rules be suspended and the bill passed.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That Nathaniel Niles, Alexander Henderson, Ernest Dichman, George W. Moss, Samuel E. Middleton, James R. Young, Samuel T. Williams, Jesse M. Sarvis, George B. McCartee, and such other persons as may hereafter be associated with them, and their successors, are hereby constituted a body corporate under the name of The National Trust Company of Washington, and by that name shall have perpetual succession; shall be able to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, and defend and be defended in all courts of law and equity within the United States; may make and use a common seal; and the said corporation is hereby vested with all the power and privileges necessary to give full force and effect to the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. That the said incorporators, or any three of them, shall, within ninety days after the passage of this act, organize said company in accordance with the provisions of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, chapter 18, class 4; the capital stock of said company being hereby fixed at \$100,000, with authority to increase the same from time to time to the sum of \$1,000,000, in such manner as the company by its by-laws may determine.

SEC. 3. That said company shall have power to make all necessary by-laws or regulations and appoint all necessary officers for the conduct of its business; to accept, hold, and execute all trusts of real and personal property which may be committed to it by any person, corporation, or by order of any court or government; to act as agent for the sale, custody, or management of real and personal property; to register or countersign the certificates of stock, bonds, or other evidences of debt, and to act as register or transfer agent for the stocks or bonds issued by any person, corporation, or government; to act as executor, administrator, or guardian by appointment under a will or by order of a court; to act as the custodian of the estates of lunatics and persons of unsound mind; to receive money upon deposit, and to advance money upon the security of real estate, personal property, bills, notes, or other security; to receive upon deposit or storage merchandise, plate, stocks, bonds, specie, and other property, and to issue storage or deposit certificates for the same; to guarantee the payment, punctual performance, or collection of bills of exchange, notes, contracts, bonds, rents, and accounts.

SEC. 4. That said company shall be, and is hereby, required to make, to the Comptroller of the Currency, and publish all the reports which national banking associations are required to make and publish under the provisions of sections 5211, 5212, and 5213 of the Revised Statutes, as far as the same may be applicable to said company, and said company shall be subjected to the penalties for failure to make or publish such reports as are herein provided.

SEC. 5. That Congress may repeal, alter, or amend this act.

Mr. COBB, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. HOLMAN demanded a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. COBB objected.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. PEIRCE and Mr. COBB were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 79, noes 82.

So the motion to suspend the rules was not seconded.

FEES OF PENSION AGENTS.

Mr. LINDSEY. I am instructed by the Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay to move to suspend the rules so as to discharge the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7099) to amend the pension laws, and for other purposes, and to pass the same at this time.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to claim agents and attorneys in pension cases," approved June 20, 1878, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That sections 4768, 4769, and 4786 of the Revised Statutes are hereby made applicable also to all cases filed with the Commissioner of Pensions since June 20, 1878, and which have not been heretofore allowed.

SEC. 3. That section 4785 of the Revised Statutes is hereby re-enacted and amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4785. No agent or attorney or other person shall demand or receive any other compensation for his services in prosecuting a claim for pension or bounty land than such as the Commissioner of Pensions shall direct to be paid him, not exceeding \$25; nor shall such agent, attorney, or other person demand or receive such compensation, in whole or in part, until such pension or bounty-land claim shall be allowed."

SEC. 4. That section 4786 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4786. It shall be the duty of the agent or attorney of record in the prosecution of the case to cause to be filed with the Commissioner of Pensions, for his approval, duplicate articles of agreement, without additional cost to the claimant, setting forth the fee agreed upon by the parties, which agreement shall be executed in the presence of and certified by some officer competent to administer oaths. In all cases where application is made for pension or bounty land, and no agreement is filed with and approved by the Commissioner, as herein provided, the fee shall be \$10, and no more. And such articles of agreement as have been heretofore or may hereafter be filed with the Commissioner of Pensions, are not authorized, nor will they be recognized, except in claims for original pension, claims for increase of pension on account of a new disability not before alleged, in claims for restoration where a pensioner's name has been or may hereafter be dropped from the pension-rolls, on testimony taken by a special examiner of this office, showing that the disability or cause of death on account of which the pension was allowed did not originate in the line of duty, and in cases of dependent relatives whose names have been or may hereafter be dropped from the rolls on like testimony, upon the ground of non-dependence, and in such other cases of difficulty and trouble as the Commissioner of Pensions may see fit to recognize them: *Provided*, That no greater fee than \$10 shall be demanded, received, or allowed in any claim for pension the cause of which originated prior to March 4, 1861; nor in any claim for pension or bounty land granted by special act of Congress; nor in any claim for increase of pension on account of the increase of the disability for which the pension had been allowed; *And provided further*, That no fee shall be demanded, received, or allowed in any claim for arrears of pension or arrears of increase of pension allowed by any act of Congress passed subsequent to the date of the allowance of the original claims in which such arrears of pension or of increase of pension may be allowed.

"The articles of agreement herein provided for shall be in substance as follows, to wit:

"ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT.

"Whereas I, ———, late a ——— in company ———, of the ——— regiment of ——— volunteers, war of 1861 (or, if the service be different, here state the same), having made application for pension under the laws of the United States:

"Now, this agreement witnesseth, that for and in consideration of services done and to be done in the premises, I hereby agree to allow my attorney, ———, of ———, the fee of ——— dollars, which shall include all amounts to be paid for any service in furtherance of said claim; and said fee shall not be demanded by or payable to my said attorney, in whole or in part, except in case of the granting of my pension by the Commissioner of Pensions, and then the same shall be paid to him or them in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved ———.

"Having heretofore paid my said attorney, in part, for his services herein, the sum of ——— dollars, that amount is to be deducted from the sum above stipulated to be paid.

"(Two witnesses' signatures.)

"(Claimant's signature.)

"STATE OF ———,
County of ———, ss:

"Be it known that on this, the ——— day of ———, A. D. 188—, personally appeared the above-named ———, who, after having had read over to ———, in the

hearing and presence of the two attesting witnesses, the contents of the foregoing articles of agreement, voluntarily signed and acknowledged the same to be ——— free act and deed.

"(Official signature.)

"And now, to wit, this ——— day of ———, A. D. 188—, I (or we) accept the provisions contained in the foregoing articles of agreement, and will, to the best of my (or our) ability, endeavor faithfully to represent the interest of the claimant in the premises.

"And I (or we) hereby acknowledge that I (or we) have heretofore received from the claimant the sum of ——— dollars, and no greater sum, and agree that that amount shall be deducted from the sum herein stipulated to be paid.

"Witness my (or our) hand the day and year first above written.

"(Signature of attorney.)

"STATE OF ———,
County of ———, ss:

"Personally came ———, whom I know to be the person he represents himself to be, and who, having signed above acceptance of agreement, acknowledged the same to be ——— free act and deed.

"(Official signature.)

"And if in the adjudication of any claim for pension in which such articles of agreement have been, or may hereafter be, filed, it shall appear that the claimant had, prior to the execution thereof, paid to the attorney any sum for his services in such claim, and the amount so paid is not stipulated therein, then every such claim shall be adjudicated in the same manner as though no articles of agreement had been filed."

Mr. MATSON. I demand a second of the motion to suspend the rules in order that the bill may be explained.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. BRAGG. I object.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. LINDSEY and Mr. MATSON were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 80.

So the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule there will be thirty minutes allowed for debate, and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LINDSEY] will be recognized to control the fifteen minutes in support of the motion, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON] the fifteen minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. LINDSEY. I will call for the reading of the report. It sets forth very succinctly and clearly, so far as I am able to understand, the purpose and object of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I think there will be no objection to having this report read without the time being taken out of the thirty minutes allowed for debate under the rule. This is a very important bill; the report is not a long one, and I think if the Chair will ask for unanimous consent that the report be read and that the debate go on afterward there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] asks unanimous consent that the time for reading the report shall not be taken out of the time allowed under the rule for debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7099) to amend the pension laws, and for other purposes, having duly considered the same, submit the following report:

The law relating to attorneys' fees, now in force (act of June 20, 1878), prohibits an attorney from receiving as compensation for prosecuting pension claims a higher fee than \$10, and permits him to collect the same from the claimant at such times as may be agreed upon.

It was stated and expected by the friends of this measure that its effect would be to diminish the number of claims filed, and thus lessen the labors of the Pension Office, and also afford more ample protection to claimants for pension from the demands of unscrupulous claim agents. But experience has shown that it has led to indiscriminate appeals to soldiers throughout the country to file applications for pension, with but little reference to the requirements of the law, the object being apparently to make such applications the basis of constant persistent appeals to the applicants for the payment of the legal fee of \$10.

Upon this subject the Commissioner of Pensions says, in his annual report to the Secretary of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1881, page 9:

"That the results of this enactment have been deleterious to the interests of claimants and agents alike; to the claimants, in that the abolishment of the contingency of success and the removal of the security to the agents has stimulated many irresponsible persons, who could be of no possible service to the claimants, to invite a general application of soldiers for pensions, regardless of disabilities incurred, by which, after filing the claim, they may obtain in advance the legal fee of \$10, and thenceforth abandon the claim, thus incumbering the files of this office and hindering and delaying meritorious claimants; to the agents by degrading the profession and bringing into disrepute an otherwise legitimate employment."

Again, he says, on page 9:

"I recommend that Congress re-enact the laws in force prior to June 20, 1878, upon this subject, and make such provision as will protect the Department and claimants alike from ignorant and useless agents and protect and assist well informed and useful ones."

In his annual report for the year ending June 30, 1882, page 17, he says:

"In my last annual report I dwelt at some length upon the subject of claim agents and attorneys and their fees. Experience fully justifies me in my opinion in all that was said in that report touching this subject, and I wish to refer to it and make it a part of this. Much time and labor are spent in the prosecution of claims by attorneys and agents, who, after years of labor, find themselves confined to a fee of \$10, and in self-interest resort to subterfuges and devious methods to obtain a greater fee from the claimant. I think this office should be relieved from the vast amount of annoyance caused by the petty prosecution of men, perhaps not otherwise dishonest, who find the opportunity offered by the receipt of large sums as arrears of pension by their principals to collect from them a greater fee than is allowed by the act of June 20, 1878, too great a temptation to be borne. Whenever such cases come to my knowledge it is my duty, and I have endeavored to discharge it by prosecuting the offender and disbarring him from practice. The offense is often so trifling that it is exceedingly

annoying to be compelled to set so much force upon such small and seemingly unimportant outside matters."

In these views of the Commissioner, so aptly expressed in two successive annual reports, your committee fully concur.

For the correction of these evils the bill in question (H. R. 7099) has been drawn by the Commissioner of Pensions, and was introduced at his suggestion. This bill proposes substantially to re-enact the law of July 8, 1870, Statutes at Large, volume 16, page 194, as it stood on the 20th of June, 1878, with a few changes and additions, intended to make it more effective in its operations, and covers the points discussed by the Commissioner in his last annual report (see page 17), where he says:

"In my opinion the remedy lies, as I have before recommended, in the substantial re-enactment of the law in force at the time said act of June 20, 1878, was passed, the salient points to be covered being, first, the establishment of a reasonable fee for the claim agent or attorney; second, the agreement therefor to be by written contract, which, as to amount of the fee, shall be subject to the approval and discretion of the Commissioner of Pensions, and the form to be prescribed by him; third, the payment of such fee to be contingent upon the successful prosecution of the claim; fourth, the payment thereof to be made by the pension agent; with such guarded provisions to be enacted as will prevent injustice being done claimants whose claims are already on file, where payment of some part of the fee has been made in advance, so that the claimant shall have the full benefit of such payment. I can not but believe that a well-guarded law of this character will attract to the pension practice an honorable and upright class of attorneys, who can not now afford to undertake the business for the fee, and who are unwilling to be annoyed by such employment under the restrictions as they exist under the present law."

The present method of collecting the attorney's fee direct from the claimant before the case has been successfully closed is found to work great hardship upon a large class of pension claimants. Many of them are now becoming infirm from age and are limited in their resources; and with their claims once in the hands of an unscrupulous and artful attorney, the impression is easily conveyed to their minds that the only way to secure prompt and favorable action is to pay the legal fee at once; and many of them thus influenced deprive themselves of the comforts of life they so much need in order to meet this demand, only to find that they have been deceived. The agent having secured all the fee he can legally collect, their case is neglected, and their only resort is to employ another, with the risk that he too may victimize them again in a similar manner.

Section 3 of this bill renders such practices impossible without incurring criminal liability, as it forbids the payment of any fees than such as the Commissioner of Pensions shall direct to be paid, and precludes the attorney from demanding or receiving any compensation until the pension shall be allowed; and section 2 revives and re-enacts section 4768 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that the attorney's fee shall be paid by the agent for paying pensions, who is instructed to deduct the amount directed to be paid the agent by the Commissioner from the sum due the pensioner upon his first payment.

Under this bill all correspondence and negotiations between the attorney and the claimant in reference to fees is at an end the moment they have executed the contracts contemplated and set out in section 4 of this bill, and in cases where contracts are not provided, the amount of fee is fixed at \$10 in the bill, thus avoiding all necessity for negotiations on that subject, as the question is thus taken out of the hands of the parties and disposed of by the language of the bill.

Your committee are fully satisfied by the statements and recommendations of the Commissioner of Pensions, by their own personal observation, and by the representations of reliable lawyers who have had experience in practicing before the Pension Office, that \$25 is a very reasonable sum to fix as compensation for the successful prosecution of an original pension claim, and that in very many cases twice that amount would not be too much. They are also well satisfied that any less sum will not call into the practice professional men of the standing the interests of the service as well as the claimants so imperatively demand.

One great want of the pension service is the appearance of a body of educated, intelligent lawyers of integrity to represent claimants in the prosecution of their claims. Such a body of men would lessen the labor and embarrassments of that office very materially, and prove of substantial benefit to the claimants, as well as an additional safeguard against fraudulent and trifling claims. But the scanty fee of \$10, as fixed by the present law, is an effectual barrier to such a consummation.

It is proper to add that the method of paying attorneys' fees proposed by this bill has been the law in reference to the payment of fees in the matter of arrears of pay and bounty since April 10, 1869, and has proved eminently satisfactory to the Treasury officials under whose jurisdiction such claims are adjudicated, and no proposition has ever been made for its modification or change.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the accompanying bill.

Mr. LINDSEY. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE. In my judgment had the law regulating attorneys' fees never been changed there would have been thousands of dollars saved to the Treasury and to pension claimants.

It is said that the present law fixes the maximum fee of pension agents or attorneys at \$10 for each case. The truth is that in almost every case the claimant is compelled to pay or does pay from twenty to thirty dollars. It is done in this way: The pension agent or attorney sends a circular into the various neighborhoods of the United States and obtains the names of all the soldiers that he can find there. They give their names, companies, regiments, places of residence, usually signing their names to petitions asking Congress to pass an equalization bounty bill or some other measure in the interest of the soldier. The petitions are returned to the claim agent in this city, under the pretense that they are to be sent by him to Congress. He transcribes on his books the list of names, &c., and then he may send the petition to Congress.

He immediately issues a circular to each of these soldiers, asking them to state the time and place of their enlistment, how long they served, when they were discharged; whether during the time of their service they were sick, if so, what was the matter; in what hospitals they were treated, and, finally, their present condition of health. Now, almost every soldier was sick at some time or disabled in some way during his service.

The soldiers to whom these circulars are sent fill up the blanks and return them. Then the agent or attorney sends them a blank application for a pension, stating that, upon the record which they have given, the attorney believes the soldier to be entitled to a pension. A declaration is filled out and returned.

That declaration when returned is filed by the agent in the Pension Bureau, and he gets an acknowledgment that the pension claim has been filed and that if any testimony is wanted to support it the agent will be notified. The agent then sends the soldier all the correspondence and asks him for three or five dollars as a part of the fee allowed by law.

After a while, when the Pension Office reaches the claim, it calls for more evidence, and the pension agent then sends out for the additional evidence and asks the payment of another installment of the fee, which is paid. From time to time they ask the payment of these fees in installments until they get \$10, when, having all the fee the law authorizes them to receive, they suddenly lose all interest in the further prosecution of the claim.

But suppose the claim to be allowed. Their entire fee has been paid. They then organize within themselves another agency or firm of attorneys, called by some other name, and send out a circular saying to the pensioner, "We have been at the Pension Bureau and have discovered that you are allowed a pension of \$4 or \$5 a month. We are satisfied from the evidence on file that it is wholly inadequate; and if you will send a petition for the increase of your pension we will have it increased." The petition is sent; and they go to work until they get \$10 more for prosecuting the claim for an increase. Suppose that claim is disallowed? Then another organization within the same body of attorneys is made, by whom the applicant is informed that they have examined the papers on file in the Pension Office and discovered that the claim has been rejected. They knew it had been rejected. They did not ascertain it in the Pension Bureau at all. They say, "Your claim has been rejected; we have seen the testimony; the claim ought to have been allowed. Send a petition to have the case reopened; and we will have the case reviewed." The petition is sent; and these agents go on and get another \$10 from the same claimant, until they have collected from \$20 to \$30 in each case.

Mr. VALENTINE. The gentleman might add that these agents collect another \$10 when they have a bill introduced here and referred, as is done in many cases every Monday.

Mr. BROWNE. I can not in five minutes undertake to tell all the devious ways in which claims are prosecuted by these agents.

Mr. VALENTINE. We have those bills lying all around here every Monday.

Mr. BROWNE. Yes, sir. When these agents fail in all these ways I have described, they then have a bill introduced in Congress and sent to a committee; and they get their fee for that. Under the present law they never stop bleeding the claimant.

Now, what is the bill? It simply proposes that the fee may be \$10 or may be equal to \$25 under particular circumstances; but it is only to be paid in the event of the claim being successfully prosecuted.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Why should not this same law be extended to claims for lost horses, &c.? These agents are now claiming in some instances 33 per cent. of the amount allowed.

Mr. BROWNE. I do not know any reason why the law might not be extended in that way. But I am talking about this bill as it presents itself to us now; and it can not be amended under the present motion to suspend the rules.

The fact that this little fee of \$10 has been allowed as a maximum fee has invited, as the report shows, almost everybody to become claim agents—men, women, and children. They are sending out their circulars and undertaking to prosecute claims. What is the result? Many of these persons, unacquainted with legal proceedings, send to the Pension Bureau papers which are so meager and incoherent in statement that the bureau can not act upon them, and consequently is compelled from time to time to send out for additional evidence, for more perfect statements, more complete details; while if the fee were such as to invite into this kind of practice lawyers of ability and integrity there would be full and perfect statements made in the beginning. Thus a large amount of trouble and expense to the bureau would be avoided and the admission of just claims would be facilitated. The present law allowing an unconditional fee has stimulated the introduction of bad claims—claims filed by the attorney solely for the purpose of getting the fee, and with no expectation that they would be allowed.

Mr. LINDSEY. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the residue of my time until we have heard from the other side.

Mr. MATSON. Mr. Speaker, when I demanded a second upon the motion to pass this bill I stated that it was done in order that the bill might be explained. I remembered that Congress at one time had enacted the law under which so many abuses had been committed and the history of which has been so correctly given by my colleague [Mr. BROWNE], I thought therefore that a bill undertaking to deal with this question ought to be considered with some care before its passage.

When the first section of the bill was read it attracted my attention, because it proposed to repeal the law providing a limitation upon the payment of fees to claim agents. My impression was then, and I still think that the law referred to provides for overcharging fees and for withholding pension-money; and this bill, as I understand, repeals those provisions absolutely without any saving clause. If gentlemen of this committee can convince me that the effect of this legislation is not to

wipe out the penalties for all the very grave and serious offenses referred to by my colleague I will very gladly vote for the bill. But if that objection obtains, I apprehend that no member of the House desires to pass a measure which will wipe out all offenses of that kind which have been committed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the existing law provide that a party receiving any fee before the claim has been allowed commits a criminal offense?

Mr. MATSON. I desire to have it understood that this bill contains a provision declaring "that the act relating to claim agents and attorneys in pension cases, approved June 20, 1878, is hereby repealed." There is no saving clause. There is nothing to save the prosecutions which are pending or to provide that these offenses may be prosecuted hereafter, whether the parties have been indicted or not. If this bill does not have that effect, I have no sort of objection to it.

Mr. BROWNE. If it has that effect, I object to it.

Mr. JOYCE. Does the gentleman suppose the repeal of this law would stop the prosecutions which had already been commenced, and would condone the offenses committed under the present law?

Mr. MATSON. If these offenses were prescribed and the penalties fixed by the law you repeal, there could be no prosecution.

Mr. BROWNE. There would be no law under which they could be prosecuted.

Mr. MATSON. I yield for five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BRAGG], and then the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. BRAGG. Mr. Speaker, I am hardly in condition to present to the House my views of this bill, but as well as I may be able, suffering under the infirmities I do this morning, I will endeavor to do so.

I desire to call the attention of my friend from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] particularly to the history of that class of vagabond claim agents whose operations he has described. They have been for years gathering up pension claims, which are now filed in the Pension Office. They have year after year bled the pension claimant, under one pretext or another, until they have bled nearly all the blood from his body. And now, having secured and having in their possession two hundred, three hundred, perhaps four hundred thousand claims pending in the Pension Office, they come here to Congress and ask Congress, in order to have respectable men enter into the business, to pass a law so they can get \$25 more. That is all there is in this bill.

Mr. JOYCE. There is a clause in the bill which expressly prohibits anything of the kind.

Mr. BRAGG. The clause in the bill is a humbug, because before this bill shall have become a law the pension agents in this city will do precisely what they did when the other bill was passed repealing the fees and reserving only the rights of contracts; they sent immediately all over the country a blank form of contract, accompanied by telegraphic notice, business could not further proceed unless they had a contract signed, and there came back a large number, a good many thousand contracts, securing those who were to get pensions by a contract when they had nothing to do, and the party receiving the bounty-land warrant came back giving them \$25 in addition. That information I have from the Pension Office itself.

And while this act may seem to apply to cases *in futuro* it does not. But it applies to every case in which a decision is not now made, and that class of respectable persons who will enter into this business are to be the attorneys of the cases.

These agents proceed on the theory, and I presume the Commissioner of Pensions proceeds on the same theory, and I regret it because I esteem him highly as a soldier and a man, that this pension business as a business is to last for all time to come. It is never to end. We are building an immense palace down here and we are to keep the thing going. I was in hope that the pension business might have an end some time or other, but they seem to be acting on the principle of the Englishman who bought a sugar-bush and said he was going to make sugar, and if he found the thing profitable he was going to keep it running all summer. [Laughter.] Now, that is what these men propose to do. We have half a million to a million of claimants. We have half a million already on file. This bill extends to all of them, and seems to make provision to pay \$25 to everybody who can invite one to come in and make a claim, and if he pays enough to make proof of the claim.

Now, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, there ought not to be a cent allowed. There should be no such thing as a pension agent or claim agent for a pension. Every soldier who is entitled to a pension, who can tell the truth, can go before a magistrate and draw up his statement and take the statement of his comrades, put it into good plain English, and by paying half a dollar to a magistrate can get all the proof he wants. What do these fellows do? They manufacture the skeleton in the first place, for which they draw \$10. They send a man his papers, telling him all he has to do is to get his member of Congress to run the thing through.

Several MEMBERS. That is so.

Mr. BRAGG. I say the whole thing should be cut off. They should not have a cent. Every honest soldier who is entitled to a pension can go to a county town or a village and say to one of his friends, I am en-

titled to a pension and I wish you to sit down and draw up my affidavit. He can have it drawn up and send it on, and if necessary he can secure the affidavit of his comrades. Notice is given to his comrades to appear before another magistrate and make affidavit. You thus get rid of the objection to having machine affidavits, drawn in the same section of the country, being all drawn in the same language, written in the same handwriting, and sworn to before the same notary public. I hope this bill will not pass.

Mr. MATSON. I yield now five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that I shall occupy that much time; but I wish to call the attention of this House very briefly to some facts in connection with this pension business, and also to a condition of things which ought to be removed before we pass such a bill as this. With much, if not with all, that has been stated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions on my right I most heartily agree. I will go as far as any gentleman upon this floor in securing the passage of a law that will bring to these cases a class of reliable, intelligent, honorable claim agents and attorneys; and I agree with him that under the present law large fees have been obtained, and will be in future by indirection, in the methods that have been suggested and pointed out to the House by him.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill propose? Does it propose to get rid of or to do away with that class of attorneys? Its simple proposition is to increase the fees that attorneys already engaged in this business may be able to secure from such claimants before the Pension Department.

I wish briefly to call attention to a state of facts that ought to be corrected before these fees are allowed to be enlarged. Only a few months ago a resolution of inquiry was sent from this House in regard to the standing and character of the claim agents of the city of Washington. A response has been made to that resolution, and is now on the files of this House. In that response, made by the Commissioner of Pensions, it appears that there were four or five hundred men purporting to be claim agents who were unknown to this city, whose names and residence can not be secured. Among those who did give replies to the interrogatories a number were found to be rag-pickers; others were employed in the Pension Department—men who were engaged in other official positions, and who were unauthorized by law to attend to such claims. In my own city a few days ago I made inquiry as to the names of certain agents there, and was sent in response a list of thirty-eight names of men, twenty of whom, although I have been living in that district for over thirty-five years, I never knew or heard of until this list of names was sent to me from the office by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Now, what we want to do, and what I regard as the proper legislation, and I have introduced a bill for that purpose, is to eliminate from this list of agents the fictitious and assumed names that are here standing at the bar of the Pension Department claiming to represent these pensioners, whereas they have no residence, no occupation, no respectable standing in the community, and even as I have shown whose names in thousands of instances are fictitious. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, before we undertake to increase the fees of attorneys, that we will see to it, as by the bill to which I have already referred and which I will ask to print with my remarks, that there shall be more satisfactory evidence before the Commissioner of the reputable character and responsibility of the men engaged in this business before he will permit them to practice before that office in the prosecution of such claims.

The bill referred to by Mr. WILLIS is as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That all claim agents, attorneys, or other persons engaged in the collection of claims for pay, bounty, pension, or other allowances for any soldier, sailor, or marine, or for any commissioned officer of the military or naval forces, or who may have been a soldier, marine, or officer of the regular or volunteer forces of the United States, shall, within sixty days after the passage of this act, file in the Bureau of Pensions, or in that bureau or department which has jurisdiction of said claims, a statement in writing, duly attested by some officer of the United States, containing their full names, both Christian and surname; or, if doing business as a firm, the full name of each member thereof, the location of their place of business, giving street and number of both residence and place of business; and, if a firm, giving the residence and place of business of each member thereof, with the length of said residence; and they shall also state their business, occupation, or profession, if any, other than the prosecution of pension and bounty claims.

SEC. 2. That said agents and attorneys as aforesaid shall at the same time and place file the certificate of the presiding judge of a court of record, State or Federal, that they are persons of honesty, probity, and good demeanor.

SEC. 3. That any person failing or refusing to comply with the provisions of section 1 of this act within the time herein prescribed shall thereafter and during said failure or refusal be disqualified from prosecuting pension or other claims herein described; and any one assuming a fictitious name, or personating another in the prosecution of said claims, or willfully misstating the name, residence, occupation, or other facts required in said section 1, shall, upon conviction be punished by fine not exceeding \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both, at the discretion of the court, and shall forever be disqualified from practice in any court, bureau, or department of the United States.

Mr. MATSON. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MATSON. I did not think that all of the time had been occupied.

The SPEAKER. Fifteen minutes have been occupied in opposition. Mr. MATSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be heard.

The SPEAKER. What length of time?

Mr. MATSON. For five minutes.

Mr. SMITH, of New York. One minute is all I desire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SMITH, of New York. I may not occupy more than one-half a minute. I only want to say a word in reference to this bill. I have not as yet read it with much care; but it has come constantly before me in the councils of this House, and I must say from what I understand in regard to it that I most sincerely protest against its passage. I do not think it is in the interest of the soldier. I think it is rather to the detriment of the soldier, while I believe that it gives the claim agent a start of \$25 instead of \$10. It does not change his character; and I do believe that under it there will be simply as much devilry as before, if not a little more of it. Therefore I protest against the bill.

Mr. LINDSEY. How much time remains in advocacy of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. LINDSEY. I yield five minutes to my friend from Vermont [Mr. JOYCE].

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I shall say but very few words in regard to this bill. It is a bill which was drawn by the Commissioner of Pensions after he had himself carefully investigated this whole subject in the light of the experience he has had while presiding over the Pension Bureau. The bill was sent to me by the Commissioner of Pensions for me to introduce and have referred to the committee over which I preside. I did so, and after a careful examination of all of the features of the bill by the committee, it was reported favorably. The law of 1870 was nearly in the same terms as this bill. That law provided as this bill does that the soldier should make a contract with the agent who prosecuted his pension claim, and right here I wish to say a word in regard to what was stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BRAGG].

Now, every lawyer, every man on this floor knows that the neighbors of these soldiers can not spend the time, even if they have the knowledge, to prepare the papers in order to obtain pensions for these applicants without any compensation for the service.

These affidavits that are taken in these pension cases must be taken by men who have legal knowledge sufficient to know how to do it, or you never could get a pension claim through the Pension Office. You go to the Pension Bureau and look at the testimony taken in these pension cases and you see how informal, how uncertain, how mixed-up it is in a great many of them, because the affidavits were drawn and the cases prepared by men who knew nothing about how to do it.

Now, the object of this bill is to protect the soldier, to protect the pensioner, to protect the claimant. That is the object of the bill.

Mr. CALKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment for a question?

Mr. JOYCE. I have but a minute remaining.

Mr. CALKINS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question about a matter, his answer to which, if satisfactory, may probably get a great many votes for his bill; if otherwise, it probably will not.

Mr. JOYCE. I will hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. CALKINS. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Vermont to the fact that section 5485 of the Revised Statutes provides the penalty and mode of prosecution for all persons who violate the present law with reference to pensions. Now, that section in terms refers to the title pertaining to pensions; and if you pass this act now and it is not within the saving clause provided by section 13, I want to ask the gentleman whether or not there is any penalty that these men are subjected to for violating the provisions of this section?

Mr. JOYCE. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Indiana, I have no doubt my friend and colleague on the committee who moved to suspend the rules and pass this bill will be perfectly willing to agree to have any amendment made to the bill if there is any loop-hole in it anywhere that will allow anybody to escape punishment for an offense he has committed.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Will my friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JOYCE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. What I would like to know is this: If a claim agent has in his hands 10,000 claims at the present time—and that is not an overstatement of what many of them have—and the limit of the fee is raised from \$10 to \$25, he will get on the allowance of those claims an additional profit of \$15 apiece. Multiply that by 10,000 and it will be seen this bill will give that attorney \$150,000, which is a fortune for any man to get.

A MEMBER. And that on claims now pending.

Mr. JOYCE. That may be an argument on the bill, but is not a question and does not call for any answer.

The last clause of the bill provides that—

If, in the adjudication of any claim for pension in which such articles of agreement have been or may hereafter be filed it shall appear that the claimant had, prior to the execution thereof, paid to the attorney any sum for his services in such claim and the amount so paid is not stipulated therein—

That is, in the contract, then it shall be taken out.

As I was going on to say when I was interrupted, this bill is virtually to bring back and restore the law of 1870, and it provides that in all these pension cases a contract may be made between the claimant and the pension agent, a copy of it placed—

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. LINDSEY] has three minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman from Maine allow me to suggest that the committee agree there may be added to the end of the bill this proviso:

Provided, This act shall only apply to claims to be hereafter filed and prosecuted.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. That is right; the gentleman had better accept that.

Mr. LINDSEY. I propose as an amendment what I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The bill is not subject to amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. It may be amended by unanimous consent.

Mr. LINDSEY. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BRAGG. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. Does the gentleman from Maine desire to be further heard?

Mr. LINDSEY. No, sir; I call for a vote.

The question being taken, the Speaker stated that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had not voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BROWNE. Let us have a division.

Mr. BRAGG. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin not to occupy time by calling for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BROWNE. I will withdraw my call for a division.

Mr. BRAGG. And I withdraw the call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ATHERTON. I renew it.

Mr. BROWNE. The Chair having announced that the necessary two-thirds had not voted in the affirmative, if a division is not insisted on I think gentlemen will not call for the yeas and nays unless they want to consume the time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had not voted in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Chair now understands the demand for a division is withdrawn and the demand for the yeas and nays to be withdrawn. The Chair therefore declares the motion to be lost.

VACCINE VIRUS.

Mr. VAN AERNAM. I am instructed by the Select Committee on the Public Health to move that the rules be suspended, that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1004) for the distribution of pure vaccine virus to the people, and that the same be passed, with the amendment recommended by the Committee on the Public Health.

The Clerk read the bill as proposed to be amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Board of Health be, and is hereby, directed to obtain pure vaccine virus and to furnish it to all State and municipal authorities, boards of health, and regularly-licensed physicians at cost price, provided that the same shall be distributed by them gratuitously, or at not exceeding said cost, the same to be designated as pure by the certificate of said National Board of Health; and for that purpose the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and the proceeds of the sales of said virus shall be paid into the Treasury by said Board of Health quarterly.

Mr. ELLIS. Where does this bill come from?

The SPEAKER. The motion to suspend the rules is made by instruction of the Committee on Public Health.

Mr. ELLIS. I demand a second of the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. VAN AERNAM. The committee recommend that the bill be passed with the amendment which has been interlined.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN AERNAM] moves to suspend the rules so as to take from the Calendar and pass the Senate bill with the amendment which has been indicated.

Mr. ELLIS. Is it in order to amend the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is in order to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill with an amendment or amendments; but only such as are included in the motion to suspend. The amendment will be read.

The amendment was read as follows:

Strike out the words "persons applying for it at cost price" and insert in lieu thereof the words "state and municipal authorities, boards of health, and regularly-licensed physicians at cost price: *Provided, That the same shall be distributed by them gratuitously or at not exceeding cost price.*"

Mr. ELLIS. I demand a second of the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. ELLIS. I object to that.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. VAN AERNAM and Mr. ELLIS were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 48, noes 54.

So (no further count being called for) the motion to suspend the rules was not seconded.

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I am instructed by the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for Congressional Library to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3843) authorizing the construction of a building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library, with the amendments reported from the committee.

The bill as proposed to be amended was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a fire-proof building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library shall be erected on such site on any one of the Government reservations in the city of Washington as may be selected for the purpose by a commission composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Librarian of Congress, subject to the approval of the President.

SEC. 2. That said building shall be erected in accordance with the plan of John L. Smithmeyer, architect, adopted by the Committee to Provide Additional Accommodations for the Congressional Library, in the Italian renaissance style of architecture; but only so much of the building represented by said plan shall be erected under this act as will be sufficient to accommodate the Library for the present and for a reasonable time to come. It shall be erected under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Librarian of Congress, who shall decide how much, and what sections of the building represented by the above plan, shall be erected under this act. And said commission are authorized and directed to procure the necessary supervision and labor, and to make contracts for the construction thereof. And the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to commence the construction of said building; and the moneys appropriated for said building shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior, upon vouchers approved by the commission. The entire cost of the building to be constructed under this act shall not exceed \$1,500,000.

SEC. 3. That the site selected shall be of sufficient capacity for future additions for the further accommodation of the Library; it shall be set out by proper metes and bounds, and a description thereof shall be made and filed in the Library of Congress, signed by the members of the commission and approved by the President, and after said filing said site and lands shall be forever set apart and appropriated to the uses of the Library.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall annually report to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a detailed statement of all proceedings under the provisions of this act.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection the second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. BLOUNT. I object.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLMAN were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 39.

So (no further count being called for) the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RICE] to control the fifteen minutes' time in favor of the motion submitted by him.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. The committee recommend as a substitute for the original bill an amendment consisting of four sections. The first section provides for the erection of a library building on any one of the Government reservations in the city of Washington, the site to be selected by a commission composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Librarian of Congress, subject to the approval of the President.

By the provisions of that section the committee avoid all the criticisms and objections made during the previous debates on the original bill to any site to be bought of any one and to any expenditure of Government money for the purchase of a site, and have left the selection of a suitable site to a commission composed of the officers named in the bill.

The second section provides that the building shall be erected in sections in accordance with the plan and drawing which is now in front of the Reporters' desk, and which is in accordance with the plan originally presented by the committee. If gentlemen will examine that original plan and then the plan at the left, they will see that the central portion of the building can now be erected in the manner there indicated.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Does the plan and specification contemplate that the cost of the entire building when completed shall not exceed a million and a half of dollars?

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. The entire cost of the building to be erected under this bill is not to exceed one and a half million dollars.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I know the bill limits it to that amount; but I want to know if the specification and plan of the Architect limit it to that.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I have the opinion of the Architect of the Capitol that it can be built for one and a half millions of dollars. The building proposed to be now constructed will comprise the central reading-room, as shown upon the plan, with corridors radiating therefrom to the outside brick walls, which outside brick walls may hereafter be used for partition-walls and openings cut through them to any additions it may be necessary to make in future years.

It is the opinion of the Librarian of Congress that the building now contemplated will be sufficient for the use of the library for fifteen or twenty years to come. It will not afford the large accommodations for museum and art purposes which were contemplated by the original plan of the building, but it will afford ample accommodations for the Library of Congress for fifteen or twenty years to come.

If the commissioners see fit to erect the building in this way there will still remain opportunity in future years to add the sides of the building as shown in the plan, so that ultimately the entire building as represented in the plan may be erected when the needs of the country shall demand it and when Congress shall deem proper to authorize it. But for the present the construction of only the central section of the building as shown in the plan is contemplated, and the expense of the whole is limited to a million and a half of dollars, which the Architect of the Capitol has certified to me he deems sufficient to erect the building. So that the purpose of the present bill is, and it is so stated and limited in the bill, to erect on a Government reservation a building sufficient to accommodate the library for the present, which can be built, and which the bill requires shall be built, for a million and a half of dollars. In this way the committee has conformed to the instructions of the House.

In this way we propose to provide the much-needed accommodations for the Library, so that collections of books donated to the Government may not be deposited in subterranean vaults where they can not be seen, but may have some convenient place of deposit where they can be used by the public, for whose benefit they are designed.

I do not wish to discuss the bill further. I have stated what it proposes. I hope the House will vote for it. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the House will bear in mind that when this subject was under consideration here several weeks ago the bill reported by the committee was amended by adding a provision limiting the expenditure to \$2,000,000 for the whole building; and the House then recommitted the bill with the instruction that the committee having the subject in charge should report a measure providing for the location of the structure on some portion of the public grounds. The clear idea of the House at that time (for it had by vote limited the expenditure to \$2,000,000) was that the committee should report a bill containing this limitation, as well as a provision for locating the building on the public grounds. The proposition now before us does direct the erection of the building upon grounds owned by the Government, but at the same time provides, according to the statement of the gentlemen in charge of this matter, for a building which it is estimated will cost \$4,000,000.

I need hardly state what is known to every gentleman on this floor, that the estimates of the cost of buildings erected by the Government have not generally been verified upon the completion of the buildings; but on the contrary the actual cost has gone sometimes 25 per cent., 50 per cent., or 100 per cent. beyond the estimates. We have generally been deceived by estimates of this kind. Therefore let us not assume that this estimate of \$4,000,000 is to be conclusive as to the cost of this building.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. Will my friend allow me—

Mr. BLOUNT. I have but five minutes.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. The estimate for this building is only a million and a half of dollars.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman wishes to answer me, let him do so in his own time.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I only wanted to correct a mistake of the gentleman.

Mr. BLOUNT. If you will take the floor and do it in your own time, I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, the proposition here is to commence the construction of the building with an appropriation of \$500,000, with authority to contract now for the expenditure of a sum not exceeding a million and a half for a part of the building.

But, sir, even if the completed building were not to cost under this bill in its present shape more than one million and a half of dollars, we know with what zeal this matter has been pressed, and if the bill should pass the House in its present shape we have no assurance that it will not come back here with provisions increasing the present expenditure. The disagreement of the two Houses may go to a committee of conference, and we shall perhaps be called upon to vote upon the conference report with not five minutes' discussion.

We are reaching the closing hours of this session. I do not see any emergency which will not permit this measure to go over until we may have opportunity to consider it fairly and fully—not in the method by which my friend from Massachusetts proposes that it shall be passed now. I do not believe there is any present pressure upon the Library demanding that we shall in this hasty way involve the Government in an expenditure which may be \$4,000,000 or possibly \$8,000,000. There is no subject upon which Congress has been more frequently deceived than in undertaking to anticipate the cost of public buildings all over the country. I trust that the House will refuse to suspend the rules in order to pass this bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to delegate to any three gentlemen the power beyond the discretion of Congress to select a site for this proposed building. I believe that the building when completed will not cost less than four or five million dollars. Its advocates admit that the expenditure may be \$4,000,000. The instruction of the House to the committee, as has been stated by the gentleman from

Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], was that the expenditure for this building should be limited to \$2,000,000, an instruction which has been utterly disregarded by the committee.

But, sir, in addition to that, I do not consider this the right way to pass such a bill, without the opportunity for full discussion and with every chance absolutely cut off for proposing any amendment which may be suggested during the brief discussion of the question.

In my judgment it will be time enough when the new Congress convenes next December for us to mature a plan for a library building, if a new building be required. This bill makes an immediate expenditure of half a million dollars and involves us in a contract which may require a further appropriation by the coming Congress to the extent of three and a half or four and a half million dollars. I think such a step should not be taken in this manner at the heel of the session without opportunity for that deliberation which the question ought to receive.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that if this bill should pass the chances are at least equal that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for this purpose will come in the deficiency bill for the next fiscal year. Although the immediate expenditure made by the bill is only half a million dollars, it will be entirely within the power of the gentlemen who are to provide for the construction of the building to commit the Government to contracts to the amount of one million and a half of dollars, involving a million of dollars in the way of a deficiency for the next fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two objections which I think should especially arrest the attention of the House. This Library is designed, in part at least, and I may say mainly, for Congress.

This library was designed in its inception, Mr. Speaker, as a means to furnish necessary information to members of Congress. Now, by this bill, not only the extraordinary power mentioned by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] is granted, the power to fix the site of the building is not only confided to the three gentlemen who are named, but also the extent to which they shall proceed in the construction of the building. As to the location of the building or the extent they shall go in its construction, there is no limitation on the power of the gentlemen named in the bill, the Architect of the Capitol, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Librarian of Congress, except, as to the site of the building, it is to be subject to the approval of the President. Now, is this Congress willing to leave it to these three gentlemen to determine where the building shall be located, and especially when it is not contemplated by the measure it shall be finished for the use of members of Congress in accordance with the original purpose for which this Library of Congress was designed, namely, to afford information to members of Congress in the course of their legislative duties?

For one, Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to confer any such power on these gentlemen. Nor am I willing by my vote to allow a deception, not intentional but nevertheless inevitably involved in this bill, a deception to be practiced in the passage of this measure, for this building, as gentlemen must know, on the Smithmeyer plan, must at the lowest rate cost \$4,000,000. Yet there is a limit provided here of one million and a half of dollars. My friend from Ohio [Mr. GEDDES], a member of the Committee on the Library, has reported to this House this plan at the lowest rate will cost \$4,000,000. The other plan, by the same architect, involved an expenditure of \$8,000,000.

But concede that the \$4,000,000 plan be adopted. You have declared in this House deliberately by your votes that a building costing \$2,000,000 is sufficient. Your committee pays no attention to that action of the House, and now reports a bill proposing to build upon a plan costing \$4,000,000, and limits the cost of the portion of the building to be constructed to one million and a half, appropriating half a million for the coming fiscal year.

The Senate, of course, will strike out that limitation, and you, gentlemen, will vote for or against this amendment with that understanding, that the Senate will strike out the limitation of one million and a half and insert the limitation of the last bill which you referred back to the Committee on the Library, of \$4,000,000. It will then come back to you through the report of a conference committee in the last moments of the session. You can not then expect a proper consideration of the measure. If it shall become the law, it will ultimately do so through the action of three conferees of the House and three conferees of the Senate, without any opportunity on the part of the Senate or the House to give the measure that careful and fair consideration which it deserves. I am therefore, gentlemen, on that ground, opposed to this measure.

But there is another fact I desire especially to call to the attention of this House. If not in this, it has been stated in the other branch of Congress, that the American Library Association favored this plan. I regret I have not the proceedings of that association, one of the most respectable in the United States, before me at this time so I might refer to them. But instead of favoring this plan, the American Library Association has condemned it in three successive annual conventions. They have condemned the Smithmeyer plan as not adapted to such a library as this Government requires. I received a letter from a member of that association, although not able to produce it before the House at this moment, from a librarian of Chicago, calling attention to the fact that that association has twice, if not three times, at its annual con-

ventions condemned this plan as wholly inapplicable to what Congress recommended, as wholly inappropriate, and opposing it in every one of its details, stating furthermore that a building costing \$2,000,000 would answer all purposes. I know of no more respectable body in the country to furnish information to Congress than that American Library Association, composed as it is of gentlemen connected with great public libraries in the country. For these reasons I hope the House will refuse to pass the pending bill.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to answer one objection stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT]. He said we will have a building that will cost \$4,000,000 in the end, although this bill provides it shall not cost more than \$2,000,000; yet that it will be so constructed it can be added to hereafter. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether prudence would not dictate that in constructing this building it should be put up in such way if it should become necessary to enlarge it hereafter we can do it? Would he have it so constructed that that enlargement would have to be done at very great expense?

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend misunderstood me. I did not say it would cost more than \$2,000,000, but what I did say was that I understood the estimate calls for \$4,000,000.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. The estimate is not for \$4,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not \$4,000,000, but as I have already stated the estimate for completing it is \$2,000,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. One million and a half is the estimate for putting up a portion of the building.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I beg your pardon, \$2,000,000 is the estimate for completing the building. The plan which we have before us shows the center of the building. This is a new plan, and the whole cost is not to exceed \$2,000,000.

But I wish to call the attention of the House to another point which should be taken into consideration in connection with this matter. You are now erecting in Judiciary Square a building for the use of the Pension Department which I believe you know nothing whatever about. There is not a member here perhaps that knows how it came to find a location on that spot; you do not know its plan; you do not know what it is to cost perhaps. Here you have an opportunity to judge for yourselves. A plan is presented for your inspection; the cost is given to you absolutely in dollars and cents; you know that it will cost a million and a half of dollars. There is hardly a member here who, if he had known that this pension building was to be erected here on Judiciary Square, would not probably have voted against it. But we say in the present instance that this is to be completed in every particular; the location of it is prescribed; and if in the future it shall become necessary it is so arranged that you can add to it so as to accommodate the interests of the Government in future years. In the mean time the building is to be entirely completed as far as the needs of a library are concerned for the purposes of this Government for the next fifteen or twenty years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that under such circumstances we have followed the direction of the House and our instructions to the most complete and minute extent. The gentleman from Georgia says that we have not; but I appeal to this House to say if we have not followed it to the letter.

Mr. RANDALL. The instructions have been disobeyed as to the amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I beg pardon; in what particular?

Mr. RANDALL. Four millions of dollars has been reported—

Mr. HUMPHREY. This provides for one and a half millions of dollars.

Mr. RANDALL. But you make no allowance for the cost of the ground.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is nothing whatever behind this bill. This building is to cost one and one-half millions of dollars, and no more. If you desire hereafter to add to it you can do so.

Mr. RANDALL. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. Is it not true that the original bill which was recommended to the committee provided for the purchase of the land? Now, in this bill, although you get the land for nothing, you make no deduction for that expense from the bill which you report here, but you bring in a bill for the erection of a building to cost one million and a half of dollars without reference to the cost of the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I can only say this, that in reporting this bill the committee have executed exactly the instructions given to them by the House. We were directed to present a bill providing for the erection of a building for the purpose contemplated on some of the public grounds within the limits of this city, and in cost not to exceed \$2,000,000. We have brought in a bill providing that this building shall not exceed one and a-half millions of dollars, and that it shall be erected on land belonging to the Government.

The building exhibited in this diagram, this large stone building, is not the building that this committee now proposes. Here, on the left of that building, will be seen a plan of the building which we do pro-

pose. The large building is substantially what we recommend, but without the wings; and from this plan it will be seen that the large circular reading-room, lighted from above, is recommended according to the plan of the original bill. Now, in future, if it shall be necessary to enlarge this building, it can be done so as to make it conform exactly to this plan shown here on the right; but for the present we do not erect the wings. In reference to the public buildings which are going up all over this country millions of dollars have been spent and there never was a plan submitted to Congress. They are going up at this time all over the country and you know nothing of their construction. In this case we give you all of the details necessary. You can see fully yourself the plan; we give you all the data on which the plan is based, and in dollars and cents the exact cost of the building. There can be no doubt of the cost of this.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to all that has been said on both sides of this question, for the reason that when this proposition was originally before the House for the erection of a public library building I think I was about the first member on this side of the House to oppose it. The ground of my objection at that time was that as the bill was then framed it provided for the purchase of a site from private parties at a cost of over \$1,000,000. Another objection was that no reasonable limitation had been placed upon the cost of the building.

Both of these objections, however, have been met and yielded to by the committee, and therefore these objections have been removed. I stood by the side of the gentleman from Indiana and other members of this side of the House in opposition to the original bill, because we feared that there might be a job behind it. If I could see anything of the kind here I would still antagonize this bill. But in my judgment there is no semblance of it. All grounds for such apprehension have been eliminated from the present bill, and we have an entirely different proposition. The Library is to be erected on a public reservation, and of course the site will cost the Government nothing.

Now, what is the exact condition of affairs? No intelligent man can go into the Congressional Library and truthfully say that there is not an absolute necessity for more room and some provision to accommodate the vast accumulation of books already there and which are coming in. Now, if there is to be an accommodation made, as we must admit is absolutely essential, the question is, how shall that be done? All of the plans so far suggested which contemplated additions to the Capitol for this purpose have been found to be impracticable, and therefore we have been forced to the conclusion that a site outside of the Capitol must be selected. I insisted that this site should be selected upon some public reservation, and after two struggles in the House the committee gracefully yielded and are now content to so locate this building.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to my Democratic friends, that having secured this advantage we should not surrender the security which this bill offers to us for the future. I fear that in the event of our failure to adopt what would seem to be a reasonable proposition now, when this matter comes up again, as it must necessarily come to the consideration of Congress, it will come in the old form of a scheme for the purchase of a site at large cost.

Now, when we are securing about all that we asked for in the past, I certainly do not believe it to be sound policy to make further opposition to it.

One further remark about the cost. My friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] when this bill was last time under consideration seemed willing a building might be erected if it did not cost over two millions of dollars. Now these gentlemen come with a proposition to put up a building for half a million less than the gentleman from Indiana was then willing to assent to.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Illinois. I have not time.

Mr. HOLMAN. I merely wish to ask, do you not know this is a four-million-dollar building?

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Illinois. I understood the chairman of the committee to state to the House that the Librarian, Mr. Spofford, and the Architect of the Capitol had declared the building contemplated by the bill will not cost exceeding a million and a half. It may be said that at some time in the future, twenty or forty or a hundred years hence, it may be found necessary to put an addition to that building, which may cost \$4,000,000. But will you attempt to prevent posterity from enlarging the building to accommodate the wants of the library in the future? No, sir; this bill here provides, as the gentleman [Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts] has already stated, for a building which, in the opinion of the Librarian, will meet the wants of the library for twenty years to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. I do not propose upon this subject to repeat anything which I said the other day. I had hoped that the Congress of the United States might consent to erect a building which should be worthy

of the nation whose library it inclosed. But I have given up that idea, and have come down to the simple question of a meager housing for the books which we now have and those which we are likely to have for the next twenty years. And I do implore this House to at least do this for the treasures of learning which have been purchased by the United States.

I want to relieve gentlemen on the other side from some of their fears. I want to say, in the first place, that the United States buildings have not as a rule exceeded a reasonable cost, and that we may safely trust the United States with building a building. Second, I want to say that the Democratic party need not fear to be saddled with the expense of this building. I say to them that we are ready to have it charged on us. I put it upon record that a Republican House is responsible for the initiation of this expenditure. And I wish I could have the consolatory hope that a Republican Congress would also be responsible for continuing it as well.

I sincerely hope we may pass this bill.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I believe I have two minutes still remaining.

The SPEAKER. The time for debate has expired.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 95, not voting 38; as follows:

YEAS—158.

Aiken,	Dunnell,	Lynch,	Scranton,
Aldrich,	Dwight,	Mackey,	Shallenberger,
Anderson,	Errett,	Marsh,	Sherwin,
Barr,	Evins,	McClure,	Shultz,
Bayne,	Farwell, Chas. B.	McCook,	Skinner,
Beach,	Farwell, Sewell S.	McKinley,	Smalls,
Belford,	Fisher,	McLane, Robt. M.	Smith, A. Herr
Bingham,	Ford,	McLean, Jas. H.	Smith, Dietrich C.
Bisbee,	Garrison,	Miles,	Smith, J. Hyatt
Bliss,	Geddes,	Moore,	Speer,
Bowman,	George,	Morey,	Spooner,
Brewer,	Gibson,	Morse,	Steele,
Briggs,	Guenther,	Neal,	Stone,
Browne,	Hall,	Norcross,	Strait,
Brumm,	Hammond, John	O'Neill,	Taylor, Joseph D.
Buck,	Hardenbergh,	Page,	Thomas,
Buckner,	Harmer,	Parker,	Townsend, Amos
Burrows, Julius C.	Harris, Benj. W.	Payson,	Townsend, R. W.
Burrows, Jos. H.	Haskell,	Peele,	Tucker,
Butterworth,	Hazelton,	Peirce,	Tyler,
Calkins,	Heilman,	Pettibone,	Updegraff,
Campbell,	Henderson,	Phelps,	Valentine,
Candler,	Hepburn,	Pound,	Van Aernam,
Cannon,	Hill,	Ranney,	Van Horn,
Carpenter,	Hiscock,	Ray,	Van Voorhis,
Chapman,	Hitt,	Reed,	Wadsworth,
Cook,	Hooker,	Rice, John B.	Walker,
Cox, Samuel S.	Horr,	Rice, Theron M.	Ward,
Crapo,	Houk,	Rice, Wm. W.	Washburn,
Cullen,	Hubbell,	Richardson, D. P.	Watson,
Cutts,	Hubbs,	Richardson, J. S.	Webber,
Davidson,	Humphrey,	Ritchie,	West,
Davis, George R.	Jacobs,	Robeson,	White,
Davis, Lowndes H.	Joyce,	Robinson, Geo. D.	Whitthorne,
Dawes,	Kasson,	Robinson, Jas. S.	Williams, Chas. G.
Deering,	Kelley,	Robinson, Wm. E.	Willits,
De Motte,	Ketcham,	Rosecrans,	Wilson,
Dezendorf,	Lacey,	Russell,	Young,
Dingley,	Lindsey,	Ryan,	
Doxey,	Lord,	Scoville,	

NAYS—95.

Armfield,	Cox, William R.	Jones, Geo. W.	Prescott,
Atherton,	Cravens,	Jones, James K.	Randall,
Atkins,	Culbertson,	Kenna,	Reagan,
Barbour,	Curtin,	King,	Reese,
Belmont,	Deuster,	Klotz,	Robertson,
Beltzhoover,	Dibrell,	Ladd,	Seales,
Berry,	Dowd,	Latham,	Shelley,
Blackburn,	Dunn,	Leedom,	Simonton,
Blanchard,	Ermentrout,	Le Fevre,	Singleton, Jas. W.
Bland,	Flower,	Lewis,	Singleton, Otho R.
Blount,	Forney,	Matson,	Sparks,
Bragg,	Fulkerson,	McCoid,	Springer,
Buchanan,	Godshalk,	McKenzie,	Stocklager,
Cabell,	Hammond, N. J.	McMillan,	Talbot,
Caldwell,	Hardy,	Miller,	Turner, Henry G.
Carlisle,	Haseltine,	Mills,	Turner, Oscar
Cassidy,	Hatch,	Money,	Upson,
Clardy,	Herbert,	Morrison,	Vance,
Clark,	Hewitt, G. W.	Mosgrove,	Wellborn,
Clements,	Hoblitzell,	Moulton,	Wheeler,
Cobb,	Hoge,	Muldrow,	Williams, Thomas
Colerick,	Holman,	Mutchler,	Willis,
Converse,	House,	Oates,	Wise, George D.
Covington,	Hutchins,	Phister,	

NOT VOTING—38.

Black,	Grout,	Martin,	Thompson, P. B.
Camp,	Gunter,	Mason,	Thompson, Wm. G.
Caswell,	Harris, Henry S.	Murch,	Urner,
Chace,	Herndon,	Nolan,	Wait,
Cornell,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Pacheco,	Warner,
Crowley,	Jadwin,	Paul,	Wise, Morgan R.
Darrall,	Jones, Phineas	Rich,	Wood, Benjamin
Dugro,	Jorgensen,	Ross,	Wood, Walter A.
Ellis,	Knott,	Spaulding,	
Frost,	Manning,	Taylor, Ezra B.	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. MASON with Mr. HEWITT of New York.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Iowa, with Mr. DUGRO.

Mr. E. B. TAYLOR with Mr. THOMPSON of Kentucky.

Mr. CORNELL with Mr. BENJAMIN WOOD.

Mr. JONES, of New Jersey, with Mr. HERNDON.

Mr. JADWIN with Mr. KNOTT.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I withdraw my vote. I am paired.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

CARLILE P. PATTERSON.

Mr. KASSON. I am instructed by the select committee in relation to the late Carlile P. Patterson to move to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table Senate bill No. 2001, and pass the same.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 2001) for the relief of Eliza W. Patterson.

Be it enacted, &c., That all unpaid national, municipal, and county taxes, general and special, and all interests, costs, and penalties thereon, levied or assessed to and including June 30, 1882, upon the property (in the District of Columbia) now held (or claimed) by Walter S. Cox and others in trust for Eliza W. Patterson, widow of Carlile P. Patterson, late Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, be, and the same are hereby, remitted and canceled: Provided, That any outstanding certificates of sale for taxes in the name of Carlile P. Patterson, late one of the trustees of said Eliza W. Patterson, shall be surrendered and canceled: And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to require the District of Columbia or the United States to repay any sums heretofore paid for the purchase of said property at tax sale: And provided further, That the acceptance of the provisions of this section by said trustee and beneficiaries shall be a full release and satisfaction of all claims of every kind on their part for damages of any kind against the United States, the District of Columbia, or the city of Washington claimed to have been done to said property.

Mr. KASSON. This being the unanimous report of the committees of the House and of the Senate, I desire for my part to take up no time in discussing the bill.

Mr. COBB. I demand a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I would inquire of the Chair from what committee this comes?

The SPEAKER. From the select committee appointed the first session of this Congress.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Appointed for what purpose?

The SPEAKER. For the purpose of considering the subject-matter of this bill.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Is the committee upon the list of committees?

The SPEAKER. It is, and has been since it was authorized.

Mr. KASSON. This bill is reported unanimously from the Senate and House committees.

Mr. COBB. I demand a second of the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. KASSON. I hope the second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection, and the motion to suspend the rules was accordingly seconded.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COBB] desire to be heard in opposition to the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill which has been read?

Mr. COBB. I should like to hear some gentleman who is a member of this committee explain the bill. The features of the bill to my mind are wrong.

Mr. KASSON. I think it requires but a brief explanation, as the report was unanimous and was printed at the last session and has been before the House for a long time.

In a word, this bill comes from the action of the House in appointing a select committee to consider the situation of the family of the late Carlile P. Patterson, his claims for special services and the proper action of the House after his death in recognition of his distinguished services.

The committee heard various gentlemen and came to the unanimous conclusion that this bill should at once be passed. That report was made to the two bodies, together with a recital of the reasons for it.

The reason for this mode of relief is simply this: In a time of great extravagance of expenditures here in Washington, at a period well known to members of this House, the city authorities extended their so-called city improvements through farm property outside of the city, incurring enormous expenditures, which resulted in injury instead of benefit to the property. The charges for such improvements were so great that the owners of this farm property could not meet the assessments made upon them, and proposed to institute proceedings for the cancellation of the unjust action of the authorities. The authorities begged that this action should not be had, and promised that they would do justice, but they have never redeemed that promise.

Captain Patterson, always absolutely devoted to his scientific pursuits, was unable to raise the money at that time to meet these taxes, even had they been justly assessed. The matter went on with penalties and interest accumulating, until to-day they amount to a sum about equal to the entire value of the property.

Captain Patterson died leaving for the support of his family means not equal to \$500. He died like a soldier, at his post, because he died of

overwork in his profession, to which he had been devoted for over twenty years, in the service of the Government. He left his family unprovided for. Without this homestead they will have absolutely no means of support; they are now in positive distress.

I desire to bring no case of private suffering before the House, further than to say that the committee are satisfied that without this relief the family of this eminent and distinguished public servant, who stands in the same rank with Professor Henry, will be left subject to poverty and absolute destitution. I will now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Before the gentleman yields permit me to ask him how much the accumulation of taxes and special assessments now amount to?

Mr. KASSON. Not less than \$30,000, and to require the payment of it by the family of Captain Patterson will be absolute ruin to them as well as injustice.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let me ask the gentleman if it is proposed to remit the taxes and not hold the property for any of the taxes?

Mr. KASSON. So far as this property is concerned it is proposed to remit all the taxes which have accrued since the assessment; the accumulation of this enormous sum of which it is absolutely impossible for the family to pay.

Mr. CANNON. Allow me a moment.

Mr. KASSON. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I would ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be better to do one of two things; either to give a pension or to make an outright payment from the Treasury of the United States to the widow of Mr. Patterson of \$30,000; or, if we pass this bill, to step up and in the same bill make an appropriation of \$30,000 to pay these taxes, one half for the District and the other half for the Government of the United States?

Mr. KASSON. I understand that the committee have thought this bill rested upon grounds of justice and law. We were satisfied that these taxes were unlawfully imposed. There were counter-claims to the amount of thousands of dollars for damages to the estate as an offset to these assessments, and they have concluded to offset one with the other.

I do not desire to take up all the time. I wish only to add that never was an officer in the Army or the Navy more meritorious than Captain Patterson; never one who more thoroughly sacrificed his life for his country than the officer to which this bill relates.

Mr. COBB. Did he not receive a good salary for his services?

Mr. KASSON. Only for the last few years of his life, after the resignation of Professor Pierce. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROBESON].

Mr. ROBESON. In connection with this bill I desire to express my feeling of personal interest and public duty. I think this bill ought to pass without a question. Carlile P. Patterson was an officer of the Navy of the old time, but resigned many years ago. Subsequently he was attached in the city of Washington to the Coast Survey, as an officer of which he was employed as a public servant without additional pay in almost every proceeding undertaken by the Government which demanded the acquirements of an organizing mind united with full scientific attainments. He was called upon by the chief of the Treasury Department to organize the revenue-marine service. He did it; and whatever there is of value in that corps to-day is due to him. He was a member of the Light-House Board. The Secretary of the Treasury called upon him to draft rules and regulations for the organization of the Life-Saving Service. He did that. In conjunction with Professor Henry, Mr. Patterson, as a member of the Light-House Board, discharged the same class of service for which that eminent scientist was largely rewarded at the hands of a grateful country.

His wife inherited a large farm on the outskirts of this city. On his pay, Mr. Patterson was able to live so long as the Government left him undisturbed. But some ten or twelve years ago the authorities of the city of Washington undertook to improve this city on a large scale. For the purpose of establishing proper levels for the streets throughout the city and for the purpose of its general improvement, they extended their jurisdiction into the rural sections surrounding the city, and entering upon the property of Mrs. Patterson they ran streets and cut avenues through it, and left her farm, which had formerly been used for grazing purposes, with ravines or cañons fifty feet deep cut through the body of it, so that it is now utterly useless to her.

Her husband, an active, energetic, persistent servant of his country, paused long enough in that career of usefulness in which he sacrificed his life to appeal to the old board of public works. Through their representatives at that time they said to him, "Yes, you ought to have damages; but do not bring a suit" (he was ready to bring suit); "we will see that you receive damages." That board of public works was dissolved. The official existence of its members has ceased. They neglected to do anything for Mr. Patterson; and they left this ruined property on the hands of his family without giving him any damages, at the same time assessing against it an immense sum of money. To-day that property which before these proceedings was unencumbered will not bring one-half of the amount assessed against it for improvements.

Mr. MORSE. Would that property bring to-day the amount of the claim of the Government for taxes alone?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, has not the time in opposition to the bill been already consumed?

Mr. ROBESON. I have done.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COBB] took the floor in opposition and had fifteen minutes. He addressed an inquiry to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] for information.

Mr. KASSON. I answered the question of the gentleman who was on the floor.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. The gentleman from Indiana took the floor in opposition to the bill and addressed an inquiry to the gentleman from Iowa. Now, I protest that the committee should have its fifteen minutes in support of the bill. I do not care when we have it.

Mr. COBB. I was not aware that the gentleman from Iowa was speaking in my time.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. He was not.

Mr. COBB. I did not so understand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COBB] is recognized.

Mr. COBB. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with any one who is so unfortunate as to allow a large amount of taxes to accumulate against his or her property. But taxes are somewhat public in their nature, and the man or woman who fails to pay his or her taxes throws an additional burden upon the rest of the community. So far as the property now in question is concerned it is proposed to relieve it from its burdens on account of the services of a gentleman now deceased, whose widow, I believe, holds the property. These taxes amount to over \$47,000—not one-fourth of which is for special improvements—the larger part being taxes regularly levied for municipal purposes. The payment of these taxes has been neglected or refused, and now the party comes in and says "these burdens are too great." The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] says that the property is not of sufficient value to warrant the payment of these taxes, although they have been paid by others. Certificates have been issued which are now in the hands of innocent parties, yet this bill proposes to remit the payment of these taxes, leaving these certificates in the hands of innocent holders, who must either lose the amount they have advanced, or must hereafter come and demand payment from the Government, which, certainly, if we pass this bill, we ought not to refuse.

The bill would be much more meritorious did it provide for paying this money to Mrs. Patterson directly out of the public Treasury. There can be no question as to the truth of my statement that for the larger portion of these taxes assessed against this property certificates have been issued and are to-day in the hands of innocent purchasers, men who paid their money for them.

Mr. ROBESON. The bill provides that neither the District of Columbia nor the Government of the United States shall incur any liability for anything.

Mr. COBB. Exactly. Therefore you provide that the men holding these certificates, who virtually have paid these taxes, shall not be repaid. I submit we have no right to do it.

Mr. KASSON. They have not been paid owing to a legal dispute.

Mr. COBB. These certificates are now outstanding for the large portion of this tax, and are now in the hands of innocent purchasers. It becomes the duty of the District government to issue certificates when there is delinquency in the payment of taxes, and those who acquire them hold them as a lien upon the property until they are paid. Now, I understand these liens are outstanding in the hands of *bona fide* purchasers, and those purchasers ought to be entitled to their money.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. Will he yield to me?

Mr. COBB. Yes, if I have time.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Why, you have had all the time.

Mr. COBB. I have had but little time, and that belonged to me.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. You have had all the time in favor of the bill as well as the time against it.

Mr. COBB. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. About three minutes.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Without any design on his part the friends of the bill have been deprived of their right to speak fifteen minutes.

Mr. COBB. That is not my fault.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Whether your fault or not, such is the fact. With the permission of the gentleman from Indiana I wish to state he is in error in his statement to the House that these certificates are now in the hands of innocent parties. And with his permission I ask to make an explanation.

Mr. COBB. Not to come out of my time.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. There are two classes of certificates. The class referred to, which could be in the hands of innocent parties, have all been paid up by the family, and the bill expressly excludes them from any release; with the exception of \$160 only. The committee had all these facts fully before them when it reported this bill unanimously to the House, and there is but one certificate, and that is for

\$160, which is in the possession of a bank in the city of New York. All the other certificates were taken up by the trustees of this estate, and there is no innocent party at all holding any of them.

There is another class of certificates, and I suppose that is the class to which the gentleman from Indiana refers, and those are the certificates which are in the hands of the Treasurer of the United States. And it is the only objection to this bill. It is that there are certificates subsequent to the year 1874 which are in the Treasury, held by the Treasury of the United States. Some have taken that objection to this claim that Congress ought to appropriate a sum of money to make that good for the Treasury.

Mr. COBB. I should like to put a question to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. I will answer it.

Mr. COBB. How much of these assessment certificates has the family purchased?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. All prior to 1874.

Mr. COBB. I do not know how much that is.

Mr. SPARKS. Why did they not pay their taxes?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. I suppose the gentleman from Indiana does not require an answer to that question.

Mr. COBB. Allow me to propound another question to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. COBB. How much other property is in the same condition in this city; how many millions are outstanding to-day that ought to be paid?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. That inquiry involves an objection to the bill which I readily admit. There are many other certificates, and the northeastern and northwestern sections were almost ruined by these assessments; but because it might be reasonable to relieve them all and because they can not be released is no good reason why this property should not be released.

Mr. COBB. I can not yield the floor any further. I have here before me a communication of Mr. Robert Dodge, the assessor of the District of Columbia, in which he states to the commissioners of the District the real-estate taxes assessed against this property, and which do not involve the special assessment to which the gentleman from Iowa has alluded. They amount to \$25,733.28. I presume it will not be insisted by any member of the committee that that was not levied in the regular way. There is no special assessment in that.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. Fifteen thousand dollars, not twenty-five thousand.

Mr. COBB. Twenty-five thousand seven hundred and thirty-three dollars and twenty-eight cents. I have it here in Mr. Dodge's statement, dated June 20, 1882, made when this was up before.

Then there is a county tax, which does not involve anything of the kind complained of in regard to special assessments. It is \$8,316.74. Then there is a Georgetown tax, amounting to \$1,921.04. The special assessment tax amounts only to \$9,714.05. Then there is the water tax, amounting to \$1,321.40, making a total of \$47,651.

And this officer states that his office has no information showing that any of the aforesaid property in the northeastern part of the city was damaged materially by special assessments under the board of public works. Here is a tax amounting to \$47,000 and the officer of the city government certifies to this House the taxes thus levied and assessed do not include any property which was injured materially by the board of public works. I say this bill if passed would do injustice to the District of Columbia and it ought not to pass.

Here is the report of Mr. Dodge:

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE, Washington, D. C., June 20, 1882.

GENTLEMEN: In answer to your request, I have the honor to furnish below a statement of the real-estate taxes in the District standing in the name of William G. Pearson and Catherine Pearson's heirs:

City, general taxes.....	\$25,733 28
County, general taxes.....	8,316 74
Georgetown, general taxes.....	1,921 04
Special assessments.....	9,714 05
Water taxes.....	1,321 40

Total..... 47,651

This office has no information showing that any of the aforesaid property in the northeastern portion of the city was damaged materially by special improvements under the board of public works.

Very respectfully your obedient servant,

ROB. P. DODGE,

Assessor of the District of Columbia.

To the COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. COBB. I said if this bill should pass it would do a great injustice to many people here. It is a wrong that ought not to be perpetrated. These parties should not be relieved from the payment of taxes which they have allowed to accumulate upon this property unless you apply the same principle to everybody else. I know persons to-day who are unable to lose the time from their labor even to come here and ask for relief from these accumulated taxes upon their little property—people who occupy a worse position than these parties you now propose to relieve. There are men and women to-day who are unable and have been unable to pay their taxes on their little homes that ought to be

relieved if these parties are. If you are going to relieve one you should relieve all, and pass a general law for that purpose and assume the burdens for the General Government and pay it out of your pockets and mine. If I should do anything in reference to relieving these tax-payers who have allowed their taxes to fall into arrears I should relieve all who are laboring under the same conditions. There is more than a million of money, as I understand it, to-day outstanding and due to the Government from these delinquent tax-payers, many of whom have been treated in the same way that it is alleged this property was treated.

Why, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for relieving this property? It is a valuable estate. I understand outside, from what information I have been able to gather from those who are acquainted with the property, that to-day it is worth \$150,000 at least; and to tell me that it will not bear its due burden of the Government that protects it is to tell me something that I do not believe.

Mr. ROBESON. Will the gentleman pardon me for a moment? The Senate thoroughly investigated this matter with a committee of that body, and that commission, after a thorough inspection of the premises, reported that the property would not sell for the taxes to-day.

Mr. KASSON. And let me say further that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia was present and inspected the property and said that enormous damage and injustice had been done to the property by the city in its improvements in that direction.

Mr. COBB. I hold in my hand an assessment made against that property in 1874, in which year, as I obtain from the official records, it was assessed at \$118,454; and when I am told here by gentlemen that that property in Washington, with all of the increase in the value of real estate here, can not pay \$47,000 of taxes, is something that I can not give credence to. I think the committee was mistaken, that is all. I have another assessment here in 1875, when the property was taxed at the same, \$118,454.

Mr. ROBESON. Does the gentleman from Indiana know whether that covers the property of all of the heirs?

Mr. COBB. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. ROBESON. I asked the gentleman if that does not refer to the entire property, covering that of all of the heirs of William Gaston Pearson. This relates to only one of the heirs.

Mr. COBB. This says the value of Mrs. Carlisle Patterson's property, and this is an official document, coming from Mr. Dodge, the tax assessor.

Mr. KASSON. Is that in the name of trustees as this is?

Mr. COBB. It does not say.

Mr. KASSON. This has exclusive reference to that portion of the property in the hands of the trustees.

Mr. COBB. All I know about it is that this refers to the value of Mrs. Carlisle Patterson's property, and it was assessed on two several years at over \$118,000. That being the case I do not believe that we ought to remit this tax of only \$47,000 upon such an estate as that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. KASSON. How much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes of the thirty minutes yet remain.

Mr. KASSON. I understood that I was speaking in answer to the gentleman from Indiana in his time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not so understand.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KASSON. Is there then more time remaining?

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Certainly not; the time has been exhausted.

Mr. KASSON. I desire to be recognized for a few moments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will be recognized if he desires it now.

Mr. KASSON. I will then say what I would have said if I had supposed I was speaking in my own time when I answered the gentleman from Indiana. Will the gentleman from Maryland take two minutes of the time?

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland. I do not care to occupy two minutes.

Mr. KASSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will simply say, summing up the case as rapidly as I can within the short time remaining, that the gentleman from Indiana is entirely mistaken when he says that this rests solely upon the ground of the remission of taxes, like any other property which may be overtaxed in the city of Washington. In the first place it rests upon entirely different grounds, and is, secondly, distinct from that proposition or from any other case in this: that this was property outside of the limits of the city, farm property, beyond the Deaf and Dumb Asylum, a point to which the city limits had not then reached. Under the system of extravagant public improvements which existed at the time, however, there were streets cut through the property, leaving large ravines there, and, as stated by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, when our committee was in conference with him on the subject, and who had taken time to look at the ground, it was an outrage upon the property, and that enormous damage had been done to it in consequence of these public works. In this way a positive and permanent injury was done to the property.

Secondly, I have to say, sir, that the very water which we drink at the Capitol, which formerly turned a mill upon that property, was taken

for the use of Congress, and no compensation was ever made, while the mill-privilege was destroyed, and that this claim is remitted among others.

I go further and say that this injustice exceeds any other injustice in this city of which I have ever heard done to owners of property not benefited in the progress of improvement. So much for that.

Now, sir, the second ground upon which the committee has acted is this, and I beg the attention of the House to it. Carlile P. Patterson is one of those men who have formed to a great extent the honor of our country in the progress of science in the world; men who are not seen in the lobbies of this House; men who are not seen begging favors of the Government; men who by night and day are engaged in the pursuit of the highest science of the country; who devote their lives to it, and who trust to the honors that may be given them by posterity as their great reward.

No man, not even Professor Henry, surpassed Carlile P. Patterson in this respect. He was made chairman of the commission to organize the revenue-marine service. In that capacity he saved a million and a half of money by the recommendations he made in connection with Professor Henry, who was with him in that service. He was chairman of the commission to organize the Life-Saving Service. He was engaged on other like duties. And for all this service he never received a cent. And now, as in the case of Professor Henry, following that precedent, as in the case of Chief-Justice Chase, following that precedent, your committee have come to the House with a report of the distinguished services he has rendered.

He was a man who died from overwork night and day. Let me speak as my heart dictates. I was his friend, and knew him intimately. I have sat with him by night while he discoursed to me of the great purposes he had in view of the prosecution of this great work of our Coast Survey. He declared a few nights before his death that he hoped by the generous aid of Congress to finish this great work in six or eight years, I forget which, and make it the greatest scientific memorial that any nation in the world had put upon the records of science.

Night and day he was devoted to it. He died poor; he died penniless; he left his family destitute if their property shall remain burdened by this taxation; his children poor, his widow poor. And now your committee has asked you to remit these taxes not only because they were unjustly imposed, but as an honorable testimonial of your appreciation of distinguished devotion to the country, of distinguished services to science, of great economies effected in our public expenditures by the great work of this great man.

God grant that the sentiment of justice and the sentiment of humanity may go together in considering this bill. Do honor to the man who has done honor to you. We intended to go further; we intended to have a testimonial by a meeting of Congress, with such an oration as should certify his great character and make it matter of history. We intended to ask you to give \$6,000, one year's pay, additional. We have abandoned all that, and now only ask you to save the homestead of the family; to let the orphans and the widow have a place to live, and not let their fortune, their happiness, their very lives be devoured by the tax-eating government of the District of Columbia.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill as read.

The question being taken, the Speaker stated that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SPARKS and Mr. WISE of Virginia called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KASSON. For God's sake do justice in this case.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays there were ayes 34—not one-fifth of the last vote.

Mr. SINGLETON and Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois, called for tellers on the yeas and nays.

Tellers were ordered, 42 members voting therefor—more than one-fifth of a quorum.

Mr. ATHERTON. Let the vote for tellers be considered as ordering the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHITE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again, without proceeding with the count by tellers, if that is not insisted upon, submit the proposition on the question of taking the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 153, nays 82, not voting 56; as follows:

YEAS—153.

Aiken,	Blackburn,	Candler,	Davidson,
Aldrich,	Blanchard,	Carpenter,	Davis, Lowndes H.
Anderson,	Bliss,	Cassidy,	Deering,
Armfield,	Bowman,	Chapman,	De Motte,
Atkins,	Brewer,	Clark,	Dezendorf,
Barbour,	Browne,	Cook,	Dingley,
Barr,	Buck,	Covington,	Dowd,
Bayne,	Burrows, Julius C.	Cox, William R.	Doxey,
Belford,	Burrows, Jos. H.	Crapo,	Dunnell,
Beltzhoover,	Butterworth,	Curtin,	Ellis,
Bingham,	Cabell,	Cutts,	Errett,
Bisbee,	Campbell,	Darrall,	Evins,

Farwell, Chas. B.
Farwell, Sewell S.
Fisher,
Fulkerson,
George,
Gibson,
Grout,
Gunter,
Hall,
Harmer,
Harris, Benj. W.
Harris, Henry S.
Haskell,
Hazelton,
Heilman,
Hewitt, G. W.
Hill,
Hoge,
Holman,
Hooker,
Horr,
Houk,
Hubbell,
Hubbs,
Jacobs,
Jorgensen,
Joyce,

Kasson,
Kelley,
Kenna,
King,
Klotz,
Lacey,
Leedom,
Le Fevre,
Lord,
Manning,
McClure,
McCoid,
McCook,
McKinley,
McLane, Robt. M.
McLean, Jas. H.
Miles,
Moore,
Morey,
Morse,
Mosgrove,
Murch,
Noreross,
Oates,
O'Neill,
Page,
Peelle,

Peirce,
Pettibone,
Phelps,
Pound,
Randall,
Ranney,
Ray,
Rice, John B.
Rice, Wm. W.
Richardson, J. S.
Ritchie,
Robeson,
Robinson, Geo. D.
Robinson, Jas. S.
Rosecrans,
Ross,
Russell,
Ryan,
Scranton,
Shallenberger,
Shelley,
Shultz,
Singleton, Otho R.
Smalls,
Smith, Dietrich C.
Spaulding,
Spooner,

Steele,
Talbot,
Taylor, Joseph D.
Thompson, P. B.
Townsend, Amos.
Tucker,
Tyler,
Updegraff,
Valentine,
Vance,
Van Horn,
Van Voorhis,
Wadsworth,
Wait,
Walker,
Ward,
West,
Wheeler,
Willis,
Willits,
Wilson,
Wise, George D.
Wise, Morgan R.
Young.

NAYS—82.

Atherton,
Beach,
Berry,
Bland,
Blount,
Bragg,
Briggs,
Buchanan,
Buckner,
Caldwell,
Cannon,
Clardy,
Clements,
Cobb,
Colerick,
Converse,
Cox, Samuel S.
Cravens,
Culbertson,
Cullen,
Davis, George R.

Dawes,
Deuster,
Dibrell,
Dunn,
Dwight,
Ermentrout,
Flower,
Forney,
Garrison,
Geddes,
Goddshalk,
Hammond, John
Hammond, N. J.
Hardenbergh,
Hardy,
Haseltine,
Hatch,
Henderson,
Hoblitzell,
House,
Hutchins,

Jones, George W.
Jones, James K.
Ladd,
Latham,
Lewis,
Marsh,
Martin,
Matson,
McMillin,
Moulton,
Muldrov,
Mutchler,
Payson,
Phister,
Prescott,
Reagan,
Reese,
Rice, Theron M.
Richardson, D. P.
Scales,
Simonton,

Singleton, J. W.
Skinner,
Smith, A. Herr
Sparks,
Springer,
Stockslager,
Stone,
Strait,
Thomas,
Townshend, R. W.
Turner, Henry G.
Turner, Oscar
Van Aernam,
Washburn,
Webber,
Wellborn,
White,
Whitthorne,
Williams, Thomas.

NOT VOTING—56.

Belmont,
Black,
Brumm,
Calkins,
Camp,
Carlisle,
Caswell,
Chace,
Cornell,
Crowley,
Dugro,
Ford,
Frost,
Guenther,

Hepburn,
Herbert,
Herndon,
Hewitt, Abram S.
Hiscock,
Hitt,
Humphrey,
Jadwin,
Jones, Phineas
Ketcham,
Knott,
Lindsey,
Lynch,
Mackey,

Mason,
McKenzie,
Miller,
Mills,
Money,
Morrison,
Neal,
Nolan,
Pacheco,
Parker,
Paul,
Reed,
Rich,
Robertson,

Robinson, Wm. E.
Scoville,
Sherwin,
Smith, J. Hyatt
Speer,
Taylor, Ezra B.
Thompson, Wm. G.
Upson,
Urner,
Warner,
Watson,
Williams, Chas. G.
Wood, Benjamin
Wood, Walter A.

So (two-thirds not voting in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended, and the bill was not passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Wisconsin, with Mr. HUMPHREY.

Mr. E. B. TAYLOR with Mr. WARNER.

Mr. JADWIN with Mr. NOLAN.

Mr. FORD with Mr. FROST.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

ALASKA.

Mr. CALKINS. I am instructed by the Committee on Elections to move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The motion to suspend the rules is not subject to amendment; and the gentleman had better submit his motion as he desires to have it passed.

Mr. CALKINS. The motion is not subject to amendment, but the day named in the resolution, which is an immaterial part of the resolution, I desire to have amended.

Mr. RANDALL. The motion must be submitted all together.

Mr. CALKINS. I ask that the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. If the resolution is submitted, then amendments can be made only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALKINS. I ask that the resolution be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Elections relating to the claim of M. D. Ball to a seat as delegate from Alaska Territory, together with the bill and reports made by the Committee on Territories, No. 1106, parts 1 and 2, and No. 1366, be made the special order for consideration on the 15th day of January, 1883, and be the continuing order from day to day until disposed of, not to interfere with revenue or appropriation bills.

Mr. CALKINS. The amendment which I desire to have made appears on the margin of the resolution. It is to strike out "15th day of January" and to insert in lieu thereof "Tuesday, the 27th day of February."

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. Is it permissible to have that amendment acted upon without unanimous consent under this call?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman can make such motion as he desires; and the resolution can be adopted as read with the amendment, as a bill may be. The Chair was trying to suggest to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CALKINS] to submit the resolution as he desired to have it passed.

Mr. CALKINS. The resolution as it was read first was the resolution authorized by the Committee on Elections. It is apparent to the House that the 15th day of January has passed, and therefore I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution with an amendment, which I had the right to submit—to pass the resolution as amended as an entirety, which motion I submit.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. I make the point of order that the Committee on Elections having authorized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CALKINS] to report a resolution fixing the 15th day of January, 1883, as the time for the special order, he can not now report a resolution fixing any other day than the one named in the resolution—can not do it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALKINS. The point of order is not and can not be well taken, for the reason that the day named in the resolution is an immaterial part of the resolution. As it proposes to make a continuing order, the resolution might as well be passed with that day in it as any other, except for the fact that the day named has already passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled on the question before.

Mr. RANDALL. The material point involved is that the committee, which has the right to authorize a motion to suspend the rules when it is called, has not authorized the amendment the gentleman indicates.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. That is the point.

Mr. CALKINS. I agree that this being a suspension day for committees a resolution cannot be offered by any member of a committee as the resolution of the committee unless it speaks the language of the committee. For the purpose of making this resolution effective, by no means changing the resolution materially, I suggest that it be made as of the day I have named.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled on this question before.

Mr. CALKINS. Very well; I withdraw the amendment, and will let the vote be taken on the resolution as it is. It is a continuing order anyway.

Mr. MOULTON. I demand a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the motion to suspend the rules will be considered as seconded.

Mr. MOULTON. I object.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. CALKINS and Mr. MOULTON were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 102.

So the motion to suspend the rules was not seconded.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (S. 2264) to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to establish them as post-roads.

REDUCTION OF INTERNAL TAXES.

Mr. KELLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to move to suspend the rules so as to pass the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk. It is a bill to reduce internal-revenue taxation.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the taxes herein specified imposed by the laws now in force be, and the same are hereby, repealed, as hereinafter provided, namely: On capital and deposits of banks and bankers, except such taxes as are now due and payable; and on and after the 1st day of July, 1883, the stamp-tax on bank checks, drafts, orders, and vouchers, and the tax on matches, perfumery, medicinal preparations, and other articles imposed by Schedule A following section 3437 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That no drawback shall be allowed upon articles embraced in said schedule that shall be exported on and after the 1st day of July, 1883: *Provided further*, That on and after May 15, 1883, matches may be removed by manufacturers thereof from the place of manufacture to warehouses within the United States without attaching thereto the stamps required by law, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

SEC. 2. That from and after the 1st day of May, 1883, dealers in leaf-tobacco shall annually pay \$12; dealers in manufactured tobacco shall pay \$2.40; all manufacturers of tobacco shall pay \$6; manufacturers of cigars shall pay \$6; peddlers of tobacco, snuff, and cigars shall pay special taxes, as follows: Peddlers of the first class, as now defined by law, shall pay \$30; peddlers of the second class shall pay \$15; peddlers of the third class shall pay \$7.20; and peddlers of the fourth class shall pay \$3.60. Retail dealers in leaf-tobacco shall pay \$250, and 30 cents for each dollar on the amount of their monthly sales in excess of the rate of \$500 per annum: *Provided*, That farmers and producers of tobacco may sell at the place of production tobacco of their own growth and raising at retail directly to consumers, to an amount not exceeding \$100 annually.

SEC. 3. That hereafter the special tax of a dealer in manufactured tobacco shall not be required from any farmer, planter, or lumberman who furnishes such tobacco only as rations or supplies to his laborers or employes in the same manner as other supplies are furnished by him to them: *Provided*, That the aggregate of the supplies of tobacco so by him furnished shall not exceed in quantity one hundred pounds in any one special-tax year; that is, from the 1st day of May in any year until the 30th day of April in the next year: *And provided further*, That such farmer, planter, or lumberman shall not be, at the time he is fur-

nishing such supplies, engaged in the general business of selling dry goods, groceries, or other similar supplies in the manner of a merchant or storekeeper to others than his own employees or laborers.

Sec. 4. That from and after July 1, 1883, the internal taxes on snuff, smoking, and manufactured tobacco shall be 8 cents per pound, and on cigars which shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or sale on and after the 1st day of July, 1883, there shall be assessed and collected the following taxes, to be paid by the manufacturer thereof: On cigars of all descriptions, made of tobacco or any substitute thereof, \$3 per thousand; on cigarettes weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, 50 cents per thousand; on cigarettes weighing more than three pounds per thousand, \$3 per thousand: *Provided*, That on all original and unbroken factory packages of smoking and manufactured tobacco and snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes held by manufacturers or dealers at the time such reduction shall go into effect, upon which the tax has been paid, there shall be allowed a drawback or rebate of the full amount of the reduction, but the same shall not apply in any case where the claim is less than \$10 and has not been ascertained or presented within thirty days following the date of the reduction; and such rebate to manufacturers may be paid in stamps at the reduced rate. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to adopt such rules and regulations and to prescribe and furnish such blanks and forms as may be necessary to carry this section into effect.

Mr. MORRISON and Mr. WHITE demanded a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. JOYCE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOYCE. I desire to inquire if it is in order to move to amend the bill which has been read so as to reduce the present duty on sugar one-half and to make the duty on steel rails \$15 a ton?

The SPEAKER. No amendment is in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether this bill has ever been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. If not, I make the point of order that the committee can not report to the House any proposition not referred to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that as a matter of fact the subject has been referred to the committee. Whether this particular bill has been referred is not important.

Mr. FLOWER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. One at a time.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make the point of order—

The SPEAKER. As the Chair apprehends, under Rule XXVIII, if this motion is made under instruction of the committee, it would make no difference whether the subject was ever sent there or not.

Mr. SPRINGER. But I make the point of order that no committee can bring before the House a proposition which has not been referred to it.

Mr. KELLEY. So much of the President's message as related to the revenues of the Government was referred to our committee, and gave the committee jurisdiction of this subject.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the President's message is not this bill. This bill has never been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the committee has no authority to report to the House anything that has not been referred to it.

The SPEAKER. While Rule XXVIII provides that on the third Monday of the month the Speaker, in his discretion, shall give preference to motions emanating from committees rather than motions made by individual members, yet that rule makes no requirement as to the reference of the subject to the committee.

Mr. REAGAN. I wish to say a word upon the question of order.

The SPEAKER. The question of order is disposed of.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the rule to which the Chair has referred in regard to the morning hour on Mondays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to hear further discussion.

Mr. REAGAN. I wish to submit this point of order: Although so much of the President's message as relates to the subject-matter of this bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee in that way acquired jurisdiction of the subject; that jurisdiction was exhausted by the reporting of the bill which passed the House and went to the Senate. No committee can originate new business, and the Committee on Ways and Means having discharged this duty and exhausted its jurisdiction in this case, it can not report a matter which is not before it, because that would be to originate new business.

Mr. HASKELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HATCH. I desire to inquire whether by unanimous consent thirty minutes on each side might not be allowed for the debate on this question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit that question when the proper time arrives.

Mr. FLOWER. I desire to ask if the Committee on Ways and Means have the right to substitute for this bill a bill that will take all the internal taxes off except those on distilled spirits, and thus give the country relief from burdensome taxation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not speak as to the action of the Committee on Ways and Means. As the Chair understands, a second is demanded. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLEY, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MORRISON, will act as tellers.

Mr. KELLEY. I presume a second may be ordered by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to considering the motion seconded?

Mr. SINGLETON, of Illinois. I object.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 139, noes 68.

So the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] will be recognized to control the time for debate in favor of the motion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] the time in opposition.

Mr. TUCKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to ask him a question before he proceeds with his remarks?

Mr. KELLEY. If it will not consume my time.

Mr. TUCKER. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he will allow me to offer to this bill an amendment entirely abolishing the tax on tobacco?

Mr. KELLEY. I have not time to yield to the gentleman; and he knows the Speaker must decide that no amendment can be entertained.

Mr. TUCKER. It might be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLEY. I could not give my consent.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my request for unanimous consent that thirty minutes be allowed on each side for discussing this question.

Several members objected.

Mr. HATCH. Who objects?

The SPEAKER. A number of gentlemen on each side.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the time allotted to those who oppose this motion will be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The time for debate in support of the bill will be divided among my colleagues on the committee—the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKINLEY, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. KASSON, and myself. I am to consume the first five minutes, and will be obliged if the Chair will call me to order at the expiration of that time, the understanding being there shall be alternation between the two sides.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill presented is a bill for the reduction of internal-revenue taxes. It consists, I may say, of two sections, one being the precise phraseology of the internal-revenue tax bill sent by the House to the Senate during the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress, and the other being amendments in the nature of reductions of internal revenue appended thereto by the Senate. Every line of the bill has had the approval of the Senate, and the committee which I represent therefore believe that while doubt and uncertainty may prevail as to tariff legislation, there is opportunity to mitigate our excessive, our dangerously excessive revenues by the amount of \$40,000,000 annually by this bill.

The House, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, has indorsed one-half of it; the Senate every line of it. I have heard and seen it stated that this bill was the result of the abandonment by its friends of all hope of tariff legislation. That is a mistake. It is yet possible that the two Houses may be brought to an agreement on a tariff bill. True it is that in this House the Appropriations Committee must, if we would avoid an extra session, claim the floor to-morrow or at an early day. Yet the Senate are maturing a bill—

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I rise to a point of order. I object to the gentleman's discussing what the Senate is doing or what they should do.

Mr. KELLEY. I am not discussing the details. I say that body may send us a bill out of which a revision of the tariff may come, but that is no reason why we should not secure to the people relief from an impending financial crisis, the inevitable consequence of excessive revenue.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, we have divided the fifteen minutes allowed to this side among five of us, and I am to be knocked down in three minutes. [Laughter and applause.]

Next in importance after the reduction of taxes is the duty to so reduce rates and revise our revenue laws, both internal and impost or tariff, as to leave a system of taxation which shall have something of permanency about it—a system so revised and reduced as to give our people and their varied industries at least a temporary rest, a freedom from agitation and uncertainty, which are always hurtful; that freedom from agitation which can only come with an actual and equitable reduction of taxes. Before this debate is ended we shall be told, as we have often been, that the taxes now proposed to be removed or reduced are internal war taxes. Sir, we are paying annually into the Treasury nearly eighty millions of war-tariff taxes because of war rates added to a protective tariff, and twice eighty millions in bounty to manufacturers as the result of the imposition of such war rates or duties.

The internal war taxes have been reduced one-half, or about one hundred and fifty millions, and now, eighteen years from the war, the tariff taxes remain substantially the same as when imposed under the exigencies made by contending armies. Sir, never with my consent shall one dollar more be taken off of internal revenue until it is coupled with a reasonable reduction of war-tariff rates. This bill to further reduce internal taxes forty millions ought never to pass without a like reduc-

tion of forty millions from the war-tariff increase. Let that be added to the proposed reduction and it will be some concession to justice. Forty millions decrease is less than 20 per cent. on the present rates, and is less than half the war rates. It is proposed by this bill to relieve capital, to relieve the bankers and chewers of tobacco, at the expense of other at least as meritorious classes of people. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] said of this bill last Saturday:

Already the steps have been taken to pass through this House next Monday an internal-revenue bill, taking from capital the burden which by a proper revision of the tariff should be taken from labor.

And he never uttered truer words. What is taken off by this bill should at least be so divided that some of the relief it will afford will lighten the burdens on the clothing and food of the people. To relieve banking capital from all its burdens and to keep for manufacturers all the protective advantages the war gave them, the friends of these two interests offer in this bill to give us all a cheaper quid of tobacco. It remains to be seen who among us will be caught with the bait. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's three minutes have expired.

Mr. MORRISON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress came together there was an expectation everywhere throughout the country there would be a substantial reduction in the revenues of the country. The President has asked it; the Secretary of the Treasury has asked it, and everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the country there has been an expectation that the war tariff, the tariff that was made when large sums of money were needed, when we had an empty Treasury and a rapidly-increasing debt, should undergo revision. The country expected on the \$50,000,000 raised on the one article of sugar there would at least be a reduction of \$20,000,000. The great commercial interests of the country expected that there would be a reduction in the present duty on iron and steel. Here in this House we have already reduced by a vote of the House the duty on steel rails from \$28 to \$15, and when that vote was passed in this House in the Committee of the Whole we did not hear the declaration that the pending tariff bill must not go through. We are now face to face with the policy declared in New York in October prior to the organization of this House in December a year ago, that the reductions can come from the internal-revenue taxes and from them alone can they come.

And we have been going on writing the history for this Congress that all of the reductions it makes shall come from the internal revenue.

The buyers of clothing—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is admitted by all that we have more revenue than is needed to pay the current expenses of the Government, the interest on the public debt, and that part of the debt which can be paid at pleasure, as well as to take care of the sinking fund. The Secretary of the Treasury informs us in his annual report that we have \$145,000,000 of a surplus, and that with safety and propriety we can reduce more than \$75,000,000 of our annual revenues.

Now, we propose in this bill which the Committee on Ways and Means recommends for the adoption of this House to reduce this sum by \$41,000,000. We propose to remove the tax on matches, which will amount to \$3,272,258; upon proprietary medicines, perfumery, &c., \$1,978,395.56; upon bank checks, \$2,318,455; upon bank deposits, \$4,007,701.98; upon savings-bank deposits, \$88,400.47; upon bank capital, \$1,138,340.87; on savings-bank capital, \$14,729.38; upon capital of national banks, \$5,521,927.47, and upon deposits of national banks, \$437,774.80. We propose in addition to that to reduce the tax on tobacco \$12,516,870, upon cigars \$9,122,926, and upon cigarettes \$278,516, making in all, with the reduced license to dealers, more than \$41,000,000 of reduction which this bill contemplates.

Mr. Speaker, everybody must confess that no matter whether we have a revision of the tariff at this session of Congress or not, the internal revenue must be reduced. Our action to-day can not promote or retard tariff revision. No matter what we do, there is but one sentiment prevailing throughout the country, and that is that the internal-revenue taxes, which were resorted to as a war measure, most of which are no longer needed, must as speedily as possible for the most part be abolished; and whatever we do, if we reduce the tariff \$30,000,000 annually, we ought still to reduce the internal-revenue taxes \$40,000,000 at least.

Mr. MORRISON. Put both together and we will support you in that.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Put both together, the gentleman says. Why, just two years ago to-day the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE], from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a bill to this House the object of which was to reduce the internal revenues alone. He did not put that with the tariff. He did not couple them together, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests, but he reported a bill to reduce many of the items that are involved in the bill before us now, and he did it when the gentleman's party was in control of this House.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that there is no statesmanship, there is no business sense in declaring that because we have not finished the revision of the tariff up to this time that therefore we shall not relieve ourselves of the burdens that rest upon the country by the internal-revenue tax system, which everybody admits and all demand ought to be in a large measure moved. Stop collecting these \$41,000,000 and let them remain in the avenues of business, where they are much needed, while if we continue to collect them they will be a constant temptation to extravagant expenditures and reckless appropriation.

I yield the remainder of my time, one minute, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for one minute.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress I had the honor to oppose the bill to reduce the internal revenues, and I voted against it for the reason that in my judgment it did not go far enough. I would support a bill now to abolish the entire system of revenue taxation with the greatest pleasure, and, most of all, to abolish its countless horde of public officers as well as the system of espionage under which this tax is collected, so inconsistent with our theory of government and the freedom of the American citizen.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania know that this bill does not abolish a single officer?

Mr. CURTIN. The gentleman need not tell me that; I know that it does not, and deeply regret the fact. But I do say, when it is proposed in this bill to relieve \$41,000,000 of taxation on this people instead of seventeen and a half millions as proposed at the last session of Congress, I am prepared to take that burden off, with the expectation that the next Congress elected in the presence of and controlled by that well-defined issue shall take it all off and abolish the officers in addition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now, with my colleagues from Pennsylvania on this side of the Chamber, notably my colleague from the eleventh district [Mr. KLOTZ], who voted with me against the bill to which I have referred at the last session, I will vote for this reduction, as it is the only real reduction offered by the majority of the House and is a measure of relief to our constituency.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MORRISON. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HOUSE. I desire to call the attention of this House and the country to the spectacle presented here to-day. For the last month or six weeks day and night we have been discussing a tariff bill, and we have been told on all sides that the demand of the people for a reduction of taxes upon the necessities of life should be met by this Congress. All last session was spent in the farce of providing a tariff commission. But what have we here to-day, sir? What does the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means present and seek to have adopted by this House under the motion to suspend the rules? The same old bill absolutely that we had at the last session of Congress with an amendment; the same old scape-goat that was expected to bear the sins of the Republican party into the wilderness. We have only your little revenue bill, with your taxes upon matches, perfumery, proprietary medicines, and bank checks, with a tobacco amendment. You went before the country on that bill, and what was the result? The people tore up your bank checks and threw them into your faces; they burned your lucifer matches under your noses; they snatched from your hands your bottles of ready-relief and soothing-syrup, broke them over your heads, and kicked you out of power with a derisive laugh. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, you are here at the close of the session, in the language of Davy Crockett, coming out of the same hole you went in at. [Laughter.] Go before the American people, if you dare, with this bill as an answer to their demand made at the last election for relief from taxation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, stated in his explanation of the object of this bill that it would prevent a great financial crisis; if I understood him—a great financial crash. And to relieve the country of this apprehension he would release bank capital, the capital representing a large proportion of the wealth of the country, from the last vestige of taxation that rests upon it to-day, and by which it is compelled to pay its proportional burden growing out of the war, thus leaving the labor of the country to bear the burden to the end of the journey.

By this bill the tax on bank capital, deposits, and the 2-cent stamp on checks, amounting to about fifteen millions per annum, is to be repealed as a tribute to a highly favored class fully able to bear the reasonable burden imposed by the present law, but you search in vain within its provisions for a single clause or item that releases from taxation in the least degree the laboring and business interests of the country.

He would relieve the wealthy manufacturers of tobacco; he would

relieve the manufacturers of matches; he would relieve manufacturers and monopolists alone, and leave the labor of the country to pay the balance of the public debt. Aye, and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] said, he attempts to catch the tobacco-growers of the country with an amendment which says to the farmers of the country: "You may sell at the place of production to a consumer \$100 worth of leaf-tobacco a year."

Does the gentleman understand the purport of this covert proposition? It is merely the naked right to sell at the "place of production," that is, on the farm where grown, to a "consumer," not a merchant, and this under the espionage of revenue spies and officials.

No, my friend, we do not want it; we throw back to you with scorn your proffered relief to the farmers of this country. What we have been demanding of you these two years has been to allow the farmers of the country to go into the open market and sell their crop to anybody that will buy it, not to peddle it. I do not represent tobacco peddlers. We do not want to peddle it to consumers, but to go into the market and sell it as any other crop that is produced out of the soil and by the sweat of the toiling men who make it. [Applause.]

I yield the rest of my time—one minute, I believe—to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. BLACKBURN. We had as well look the facts in the face. We know if any tariff revision is to be had at this session of Congress, or at the hands of this Congress at all, it is to come through this bill now pending in the Senate. We know it is not a physical possibility to enact into law the tariff bill now pending in the House. We know as well as we know anything that if you pass the bill now offered for consideration it takes away the last chance the Senate bill will have for action when it reaches the House. Gentlemen may as well admit the fact and play an open hand. This is an effort to kill all possibility of any tariff revision at the hands of this Congress at all. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MORRISON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE].

Mr. CARLISLE. Having promised part of my three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE], I shall have no time to make a response to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY] who has referred to my action heretofore respecting the abolition of parts of these taxes. If the gentleman will put in the RECORD, so that the country may see it, the entire report made by me upon the occasion alluded to I shall be perfectly content.

Mr. Speaker, my opinion has been, and is now, that whenever we touch these internal-revenue taxes we ought to take from the statute-book the entire tax upon each article to which our legislation relates, and thereby diminish the horde of office-holders now required by the Government to enforce this law. [Applause.] Whenever it is not possible to repeal the whole tax upon an article at once the proposition to reduce it should be accompanied by suitable provisions for reducing the cost of collecting the remainder. We ought, in my opinion, to simplify the methods of collection, reduce the number of officers, and thus diminish the cost of the service every time we undertake to curtail the receipts from the internal-revenue system.

This bill not only fails to make provision for the reduction of the official forces, but it proposes no plan or scheme for the reduction of the expenses of collection. It will require just as many officers and cost just as much money under this bill to collect a tax of 8 cents per pound upon tobacco as it now costs to collect 16 cents per pound, while the Government itself will receive only half as much revenue from that source as it now receives. The bill is not only defective in this respect, but it contains a crude and imperfect provision in relation to the sale of leaf-tobacco by farmers and producers, which will at once subject every farmer in the country who raises tobacco upon his land to the espionage of the whole army of spies and informers in the service of the Internal-Revenue Bureau.

The provisions of the bill are such that the farmer can not possibly undertake to avail himself of the poor privilege it purports to confer without subjecting himself to instant and constant danger of arrest and prosecution.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER. One minute.

Mr. BROWNE. I regret exceedingly I am confronted with this question. At the last session of Congress I voted for the repeal of so much of the internal-revenue law as was touched by the bill then passed. What is this proposition? It is to add to this a reduction of \$20,000,000 on tobacco.

A MEMBER. Twenty-one millions.

Mr. BROWNE. A reduction of twenty-one to twenty-two millions on tobacco. I voted to relieve the banks—capital, deposits, check stamps—perfumery, patent medicines, and all. But when they ask to add to these a reduction of more than twenty millions on tobacco, a luxury, and this Congress is not to reduce a penny on the tax on sugar, an article consumed by 52,000,000 of our people—

Mr. DUNN. Or salt either.

Mr. BROWNE. For that reason only I refuse to vote for this bill.

Mr. KASSON. I hope no member on either side of this House will underestimate the importance of his vote on this proposition. I hope no member will cast his vote upon party grounds.

I have a right, if any man has, to speak for those who have diligently sought through this Congress to obtain a larger reduction of revenue, both by modifications of the tariff and of the internal-revenue tax system, than it is now probable we shall be able to obtain. If I thought that the passage of this bill would have one feather's weight of influence to prevent us from reducing the tariff I should stand here and oppose it.

I desire and have urged upon both sides of the House more prompt action on the tariff bill. I shall from day to day, by efforts to amend the rules if necessary, by efforts to abbreviate debate, by every effort known to legislation, endeavor to carry through either the bill from the Senate or the one from the Committee on Ways and Means to reduce duties on imports. I am not here, therefore, to advocate the passage of this bill to reduce internal revenue as a means of delaying or preventing action on the tariff bill.

The proposition made by the Committee on Ways and Means to this House at the beginning of this Congress was that at all events we should reduce the revenue derived from internal taxation. We have now the revision of the Senate of our internal-revenue reduction bill. We know what it is, and we say to them again, do this, and do it promptly, and thereby relieve the people from some portion of the burdens imposed upon them.

And how is the proposition met? I assure gentlemen that the country will understand whether we deal in party subterfuges or are in earnest to lighten their burden.

What does this bill propose? Besides taking internal taxes off all except four articles, it affects from four hundred to six hundred thousand individuals who pay a large amount of money for the right to do a lawful business. Every cigar manufacturer and dealer will have his personal tax reduced by this bill, which tax he can not charge over to the consumer. Do you suppose that those 400,000 and the hundreds of thousands employed by them will not know whether you do them wrong if you refuse to reduce this personal tax?

Do you suppose that those farmers whom you gentlemen tell us about will not care for this privilege of selling at the place of production \$100 worth of their leaf-tobacco each year? Do you suppose they will not read your speeches made during this Congress on every bill where you have had the chance in which you have demanded for them that right and that privilege?

Mr. HATCH. There is no privilege in it.

Mr. KASSON. That is now in this bill, and it is tendered to them, as it has been over and over again demanded by them, and gentlemen upon the other side say they will fling it back into our faces. Do you suppose the people of this country are fools, and that they will not understand the votes of gentlemen here when it is proposed to take taxes off them which they want taken off, which they demand to have taken off, which they have petitioned to Congress to have taken off, which they have asked their Representatives to introduce bills for the purpose of taking off? I am for reducing taxation here; I am for reducing it upon the tariff. If we can not get both I will take one.

The Committee on Ways and Means, as far as my knowledge goes, has presented this bill solely for the purpose of taking the double chance of passing this bill and then, if possible, to pass a bill for the reduction of the tariff. My opinion is precise and clear that this at least may become the law of the land.

The SPEAKER. The time for debate has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. I call for the yeas and nays upon my motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. TUCKER. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TUCKER. I have been excluded from any participation in this debate. I was not present at the meeting of the committee at which this bill was agreed upon, not having received any notice to attend. I ask that I may be permitted to print in the RECORD what I might have said if I had had the poor privilege of saying it.

There was no objection, and leave was granted accordingly. [See Appendix.]

Mr. WHEELER. I ask also the same privilege.

There was no objection. [See Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that general leave be granted to print in the RECORD remarks upon this subject.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest that all have the privilege of printing remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to giving general leave to print in the RECORD remarks upon the bill now before the House?

Several members objected.

Mr. KASSON. I must object at this juncture. I want the vote to be now taken; after that I will not make objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon ordering the yeas and nays upon the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill which has been read.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 97, not voting 32; as follows:

YEAS—162.

Aldrich,	Farwell, Chas. B.	Latham,	Scranton,
Armfield,	Farwell, Sewell S.	Lord,	Shallenberger,
Barr,	Fisher,	Lynch,	Shelley,
Bayne,	Flower,	McClure,	Shultz,
Beach,	Fulkerson,	McCoid,	Skinner,
Belford,	Geddes,	McCook,	Smalls,
Beltzhoover,	George,	McKinley,	Smith, A. Herr
Bingham,	Gibson,	McLane, Robt. M.	Smith, Dietrich C.
Bisbee,	Godshalk,	McLean, Jas. H.	Spaulding,
Bliss,	Grout,	Miles,	Speer,
Bowman,	Hall,	Miller,	Spooner,
Brewer,	Hammond, John	Moore,	Stone,
Buck,	Hardenbergh,	Morey,	Strait,
Buckner,	Hardy,	Morse,	Talbot,
Burrows, Julius C.	Harmer,	Mutchler,	Taylor, Joseph D.
Butterworth,	Harris, Benj. W.	Neal,	Thomas,
Cabell,	Harris, Henry S.	Norcross,	Townsend, Amos
Campbell,	Haskell,	O'Neill,	Tucker,
Candler,	Hazelton,	Parker,	Tyler,
Cannon,	Heilman,	Peelle,	Valentine,
Carpenter,	Henderson,	Peirce,	Vance,
Chapman,	Hewitt, G. W.	Pettibone,	Van Aernam,
Clements,	Hill,	Phelps,	Van Horn,
Converse,	Hiscock,	Phister,	Van Voorhis,
Cox, William R.	Hitt,	Pound,	Wadsworth,
Covington,	Hoblitzell,	Prescott,	Wait,
Crapo,	Hoge,	Randall,	Walker,
Cullen,	Horr,	Ranney,	Ward,
Curtin,	Houk,	Reed,	Washburn,
Cutts,	Hubbell,	Rice, John B.	Watson,
Darrall,	Hubbs,	Rice, Wm. W.	Webber,
Davidson,	Humphrey,	Rich,	West,
Davis, George R.	Hutchins,	Richardson, D. P.	Williams, Chas. G.
Dawes,	Jacobs,	Ritchie,	Willis,
Deering,	Jorgensen,	Robeson,	Willits,
Dezendorf,	Kasson,	Robinson, Geo. D.	Wilson,
Dowd,	Kelley,	Robinson, Jas. S.	Wise, George D.
Dwight,	Kenna,	Ross,	Wise, Morgan R.
Ellis,	Ketcham,	Russell,	Young,
Ermentrout,	Klotz,	Scales,	
Errett,	Lacey,	Scoville,	

NAYS—97.

Aiken,	Culberson,	Knott,	Robinson, Wm. E.
Anderson,	Davis, Lowndes H.	Ladd,	Rosecrans,
Atherton,	De Motte,	Leedom,	Ryan,
Atkins,	Deuster,	Le Fevre,	Simonton,
Barbour,	Dibrell,	Lindsey,	Singleton, Jas. W.
Belmont,	Dingley,	Manning,	Singleton, Otho R.
Berry,	Dunn,	Marsh,	Smith, J. Hyatt
Blackburn,	Dunnell,	Martin,	Sparks,
Bland,	Evens,	Matson,	Springer,
Blount,	Forney,	McKenzie,	Steele,
Bragg,	Garrison,	McMillin,	Stockslager,
Briggs,	Guenther,	Mills,	Thompson, P. B.
Buchanan,	Gunter,	Money,	Townshend, R. W.
Burrows, Jos. H.	Hammond, N. J.	Morrison,	Turner, Henry G.
Caldwell,	Haseltine,	Moulton,	Turner, Oscar
Carlisle,	Hatch,	Muldrow,	Updegraff,
Cassidy,	Hepburn,	Murch,	Upson,
Caswell,	Herbert,	Oates,	Wellborn,
Clardy,	Holman,	Payson,	Wheeler,
Clark,	Hooker,	Ray,	White,
Cobb,	House,	Reagan,	Whitthorne,
Colerick,	Jones, Geo. W.	Reese,	Williams, Thomas.
Cook,	Jones, James K.	Rice, Theron M.	
Cox, Samuel S.	Joyce,	Richardson, J. S.	
Cravens,	King,	Robertson,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Black,	Crowley,	Jones, Phineas	Paul,
Blanchard,	Dorey,	Lewis,	Sherwin,
Browne,	Dugro,	Mackey,	Taylor, Ezra B.
Brumm,	Ford,	Mason,	Thompson, Wm. G.
Calkins,	Frost,	Mosgrove,	Urner,
Camp,	Herndon,	Nolan,	Warner,
Chace,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Pacheco,	Wood, Benj.
Cornell,	Jadwin,	Page,	Wood, Walter A.

So (two-thirds not voting in favor thereof) the motion of Mr. KELLEY was not agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. BROWN (who would vote "no") with Mr. CROWLEY (who would vote "ay").

Mr. CHACE with Mr. BLACK.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the names be dispensed with.

Mr. RICE, of Missouri. I object.

The names having been read,

Mr. RICE, of Missouri, said: I rise to ask a correction of the record of this vote. The name of my colleague, Mr. FORD, was just read as having voted in the affirmative. He was not in the Hall for an hour before the roll-call. To assure myself of this fact I went to the cloak-room and learned that he had been gone for some time. I call attention to this matter for the reason that I believe he would, if present, have voted in the negative.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk states that some one answered when Mr. FORD's name was called.

Mr. MCCOID. I believe I answered when the name of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. FORD, was called, mistaking his name for my own.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MCCOID] states, as the Chair understands, that owing to a mistake of hearing he thinks

he answered when the name of Mr. FORD was called. If there be no objection the name of Mr. FORD will be omitted from the record of the vote.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman from Missouri may have been present and may have voted and afterward left the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The record of the vote can be corrected hereafter if there should be a mistake.

Mr. BURROWS, of Missouri. I am satisfied that Mr. FORD has not been in the House for two hours.

The SPEAKER. This vote will not change the result. On this question the yeas are 162, the nays 97. Two-thirds not voting in the affirmative, the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is not agreed to. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the House now adjourn, my object being to avoid a night session.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 108, noes 90.

Mr. ALDRICH. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HASELTINE. I call for tellers.

Tellers were not ordered.

So the motion of Mr. RANDALL was agreed to.

Prior to the announcement of the result, the following proceedings took place:

ILLEGAL AND FRAUDULENT ENTRY OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. RYAN, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 7628) making an appropriation for the protection of public lands from illegal and fraudulent entry, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ELI T. PARKILL.

Mr. HUMPHREY, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 7629) for the relief of Eli T. Parhill; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

PATENTS.

Mr. VANCE, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Patents a bill (H. R. 7630) to amend section 4887 of the Revised Statutes in relation to patents; which was read a first and second time, ordered to be printed, and recommitted.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. MCCOOK, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw papers in the case of Sergeant James O'Brien, Third United States Artillery, no adverse report having been made.

Mr. WAIT, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw papers in the case of Captain Samuel Jeffries, which have been referred to the Committee on Claims, there being no adverse report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WARNER, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. PAUL, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SKINNER, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

REPORT ON INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House the following resolution of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring). That of the report on industrial education, furnished by the Commissioner of Education to the Senate, in compliance with its resolution of December 15, 1882, there be printed 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for distribution by the Commissioner of Education.

The result of the vote on the motion to adjourn was then announced; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: The petition of citizens of West Virginia, relating to bounties and pensions—to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay.

Also, four joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Montana.

By Mr. ALDRICH: The petition of John V. Farwell & Co. and 115 other business firms of the city of Chicago, asking for the necessary appropriation for the continuance of the immigrant-inspection service—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERRY: The resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, California, protesting against the transfer of the revenue-marine service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CALKINS: The resolutions adopted by the Legislature of

Indiana, in relation to pensions for the soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE MOTTE: Memorial of the Legislature of Indiana on the subject of pension legislation—to the same committee.

By Mr. DOWD: The petition of G. W. Clark and others, for a post-route from Gastonia, North Carolina, to Riverside, South Carolina—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GEDDES: The resolutions adopted by the Toledo (Ohio) Produce Exchange, protesting against the provision in Senate bill No. 1382 which relates to the sale and purchase for future delivery of the commodities of the country—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper relating to the pension claim of John E. Narcham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEILMAN: The resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Indiana, praying for the extension of the arrears-of-pension act—to the same committee.

By Mr. JOYCE: The petition of Eli B. Parker, for a pension—to the same committee.

By Mr. MACKEY: The petition of the pilots of the port of Charleston, South Carolina, protesting against the passage of any act abolishing compulsory pilotage—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MATSON: The petition of William Wainwright and 64 others, asking that a pension be granted to W. E. Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHISTER: The petition of G. W. Hannah and 91 others, of Johnson County, Kentucky, for the passage of bill (H. R. 2625) granting one hundred and sixty acres of land to the volunteer soldiers of the late war—to the same committee.

By Mr. VANCE: The petition of J. S. Woodward and 50 others, for a mail-route—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VAN HORN: The petition of J. W. Parish, for relief—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHEELER: Paper relating to the instrument invented by Frank Moore for determining the error of the compass—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON: The petition of Jeremiah Hodge and 80 others, citizens of West Virginia, praying that a pension be granted to the said Hodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, the petition of Daniel Wilson, for a pension—to the same committee.

The following petitions relating to tariff legislation were presented and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Of C. M. Henderson & Co. and 17 others, shoe manufacturers and dealers in leather, of Chicago, Illinois.

By Mr. BAYNE: The resolutions adopted by the employes of the Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania) Iron Works.

By Mr. COOK: Of colored and other laborers of Macon and Stewart Counties, Georgia.

By Mr. ERRETT: The resolutions adopted by Duquesne Lodge, No. 1, of Amalgamated Association of Iron Workers, of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Also, of the resolutions adopted by the workingmen at the mill of J. Painter & Son, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. JACOBS: Of Thomas Readding and 69 others, of Otego, of John Sweet and 16 others, of Milford, and of B. F. Van Zandt & Son and 76 others, of Maryland, New York.

By Mr. LE FEVRE: Of citizens of Allen County, Ohio.

By Mr. MONEY: Of citizens of Noxubee County, Mississippi.

By Mr. MOORE: Of citizens of La Grange, Lee County, Arkansas, and of citizens of Eudora, De Soto County, Mississippi.

By Mr. WEBBER: Of Isaac M. Ferguson and 147 others, citizens of Polkton, Ottawa County, and of Jacob Barr and 39 others, of Grand Haven, Michigan.

By Mr. WILSON: Of H. R. Black and 55 others, of West Virginia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 20, 1883.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

The Principal Legislative Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. ALDRICH, and by unanimous consent, the reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate authorizing the Public Printer to exchange duplicate volumes of the Congressional Globe in his custody.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 331) for the printing of the Agricultural Report for the year 1883; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a con-

current resolution for the printing of 15,560 copies of the report of the Smithsonian Institution for the year 1882.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a memorial of booksellers, printers, and binders in the city of New York, protesting against the proposed change in the impost laws by which the duties on books imported are to be reduced; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the pilots on the bar and harbor of Charleston, South Carolina, praying that no act be passed abolishing compulsory pilotage; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the following resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

A joint resolution for the relief of John Fenske.

Whereas John Fenske, of the city of New Ulm, in the county of Brown and State of Minnesota, on the 18th day of August, A. D. 1862, while in the employment of the United States as a mechanic, and while endeavoring to save the property of the Government from destruction, received a severe wound from Sioux Indians, whereby he was permanently disabled; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States providing that the name of said John Fenske be placed on the roll of invalid pensioners: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and are hereby, requested to use their influence to secure the immediate passage of an act granting an invalid pension to said John Fenske, and that the same date from the time of receiving said injury.

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

C. A. GILMAN,
President of the Senate.

L. FLETCHER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 14, A. D. 1883.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
Department of State:

I hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing with the original now on file in this department, and that it is a true and correct copy thereof, and of the whole of the same.

Witness my hand and the great seal of the State this 16th day of February, A. D. 1883.

[SEAL.]

FRED VON BAUMBACH,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the following memorial of the Legislature of Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, would respectfully urge the immediate passage of a bill creating a port of entry at the village of Saint Vincent, in the county of Kittson and State of Minnesota, the same to take the place of the present port of entry at Pembina, in the Territory of Dakota, and abolishing said last-named port of entry.

A bill to this effect, introduced by Hon. W. D. Washburn, passed the House of Representatives some time since, and has been read twice in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it now rests. The reasons for the passage of such bill are conclusive to those who have given the matter any consideration, and the same was strongly recommended by the late Secretary Sherman and is approved by the present Secretary Folger.

Pembina is without railroad connections, while Saint Vincent has both river and railroad facilities for the transaction of the business of such port of entry, and all goods to and from Manitoba are necessarily transferred at Saint Vincent, and do not pass through said Pembina, and all the officers and clerks of said present port of entry, except the collector, do now actually reside and transact all the business thereof at said village of Saint Vincent.

Your memorialists therefore pray that the said bill may receive immediate attention and become a law without delay.

L. FLETCHER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. A. GILMAN,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 14, A. D. 1883.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
Department of State:

I hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing with the original now on file in this department, and that it is a true and correct copy thereof, and of the whole of the same.

Witness my hand and the great seal of the State this 14th day of February, A. D. 1883.

[SEAL.]

FRED VON BAUMBACH,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PLUMB presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Kansas, in favor of the passage of a law granting a reasonable pension to all soldiers of the late war who were confined for a period of three months or more in Libby, Andersonville, or any other military prison of the late confederacy; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB. I present several petitions signed by a very large number of ex-soldiers of the Union Army, now residing in the State of Kansas, both in their individual capacity and through the medium of the organization known as the Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Kansas. I move their reference to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. I present a petition of S. Ray Sands, E. H. Mitchell, and others, representing that the harbor of refuge at Block Island is very much crowded and that great inconvenience is suffered from want of proper regulation in regard to the anchoring of vessels, and praying